


ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL

Available Online: <https://assajournal.com>
 Vol. 05 No. 02. April-June 2026. Page# 106-113
 Print ISSN: [3006-2497](https://doi.org/10.3006-2497) Online ISSN: [3006-2500](https://doi.org/10.3006-2500)
 Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](https://www.openjournal.org/)


Methodological Foundations of Legal Research: A Critical Examination of Doctrinal, Comparative, and Socio-Legal Approaches

Mr. Ayaz Khan

Ph.D. (Law) Research Scholar, Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan
 Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
ayazkhan.law@awkum.edu.pk

Aisha Nayab Qureshi

Ph.D. (Law) Research Scholar, Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan
 Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
aisha.nayab@uoh.edu.pk

Professor Dr. Muhammad Zubair Khan

Chairman/Supervisor, Department of Law, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan
 Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
mzubair@awkum.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Legal research methodology has undergone significant transformation over the past several decades, evolving from traditional doctrinal analysis toward increasingly interdisciplinary and empirical approaches. This paper provides a comprehensive critical examination of three foundational methodological paradigms in contemporary legal scholarship: doctrinal legal research, comparative law methodology, and socio-legal studies. Through systematic analysis of recent scholarly developments, this study evaluates the epistemological foundations, methodological procedures, strengths, and limitations of each approach. The paper argues that while doctrinal research remains essential for maintaining legal coherence and normative clarity, its integration with comparative and socio-legal methodologies offers the most robust framework for addressing complex legal challenges in an era of globalization and rapid social change. The analysis draws upon verified scholarly sources to demonstrate how methodological pluralism has become not merely an academic preference but a necessity for effective legal research. This study contributes to the ongoing discourse on legal research methodology by proposing a synthesized framework that preserves the rigor of traditional doctrinal analysis while incorporating the contextual insights of comparative and empirical approaches.

Keywords: *Legal Research Methodology, Doctrinal Research, Comparative Law, Socio-Legal Studies, Empirical Legal Research, Interdisciplinary Legal Scholarship*

Background

The methodological foundations of legal research have become increasingly contested terrain within contemporary legal scholarship. As law faces unprecedented challenges from globalization, technological disruption, and evolving social norms, the methods through which legal knowledge is produced, validated, and applied have assumed critical importance (Siems, 2022). The traditional dominance of doctrinal legal research characterized by systematic analysis of legal texts, statutes, and judicial decisions has been progressively challenged by comparative and socio-legal approaches that emphasize contextual understanding, empirical investigation, and interdisciplinary synthesis (Hutchinson, 2013; Van Hoecke, 2011).

This paper critically examines three principal methodological approaches that currently shape legal research: doctrinal legal research, comparative law methodology, and socio-legal studies. Each approach represents distinct epistemological commitments and methodological procedures, yet contemporary legal scholarship increasingly recognizes their complementary potential (McConville & Chui, 2017). The central thesis of this paper is that methodological pluralism strategically integrating doctrinal,

comparative, and socio-legal approaches provides the most comprehensive framework for contemporary legal research.

The significance of this inquiry extends beyond academic methodology to fundamental questions about the nature of legal knowledge and the role of legal scholarship in society. As Cotterrell (2023) observes, socio-legal studies now represent "a wider reaching out ... into many disciplines in the social and human sciences and the humanities that can illuminate the nature of law" (p. 4). Simultaneously, doctrinal research continues to provide the normative coherence necessary for legal certainty and predictability (Omar et al., 2025). Comparative methodology, meanwhile, offers essential tools for navigating legal pluralism in an interconnected world (Siems, 2022; Zweigert & Kötz, 1998).

This paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 examines doctrinal legal research, analyzing its foundational principles, methodological procedures, recent critiques, and enduring significance. Section 3 explores comparative law methodology, focusing particularly on the functional approach and emerging alternatives. Section 4 investigates socio-legal studies, emphasizing empirical methods and interdisciplinary integration. Section 5 critically evaluates the relationships among these approaches and proposes a synthesized methodological framework. Section 6 concludes with reflections on the future of legal research methodology.

Doctrinal Legal Research: Foundations and Evolution

Conceptual Foundations and Defining Characteristics

Doctrinal legal research, often termed "black-letter law" research, has historically constituted the dominant paradigm in legal scholarship. This approach centers on systematic analysis of primary legal sources including constitutions, statutes, regulations, and judicial decisions supplemented by authoritative secondary materials such as legal treatises and academic commentary (Majeed et al., 2023; Omar et al., 2025). The term "doctrine" derives from the Latin *doctrina*, meaning instruction or teaching, reflecting this methodology's pedagogical and normative functions (Bhagamma, 2023).

The epistemological foundation of doctrinal research rests upon legal positivism the theory that law comprises a system of rules validly established by recognized authorities, independent of moral or social considerations (Hart, 1994). This positivist orientation shapes doctrinal research's distinctive characteristics: normativity, systematization, and internal perspective (Hutchinson, 2013). Doctrinal scholars analyze law from within the legal system, employing concepts, categories, and reasoning methods recognized by legal practitioners and institutions.

Recent scholarship has reaffirmed doctrinal research's essential role in legal scholarship while acknowledging necessary methodological refinements. According to Omar et al. (2025), doctrinal research "remains the principal methodology in legal scholarship," particularly for studies examining regulatory frameworks, compliance mechanisms, and enforcement structures. The methodology provides "comprehensive analytical tools for examining various governance instruments, including corporate liability frameworks, stakeholder protection mechanisms, and regulatory accountability structures" (Omar et al., 2025, p. 2107).

Methodological Procedures

Contemporary doctrinal research follows systematic procedures that ensure analytical rigor and reproducibility. Majeed et al. (2023) identify five essential stages: (1) precise problem identification and research question formulation; (2) comprehensive collection of primary and secondary legal materials; (3) critical evaluation and analysis of sources; (4) analytical synthesis integrating findings into coherent legal arguments; and (5) normative conclusion drawing with recommendations for legal development or reform.

The analytical techniques employed in doctrinal research include statutory interpretation, case analysis, and logical reasoning through deduction and analogy. Historical legal research examining the evolution of legal doctrines over time represents a crucial dimension of doctrinal methodology, providing "guidance to the researcher" and ensuring that analysis is "well-directed" (Srivastava, 2024, p. 99). Historical analysis prevents anachronistic interpretations and illuminates the contingent nature of apparently settled legal principles.

Contemporary Critiques and Responses

Doctrinal research has faced substantial critiques from socio-legal scholars and legal realists who argue that exclusive focus on legal texts produces "law in books" disconnected from "law in action" (Pound, 1910; Twining, 2009). Critics contend that doctrinarism's normative orientation and isolation from empirical methods limit its capacity to address how law actually functions in society (Cownie et al., 2014; Wheeler, 2020).

Recent scholarship has responded to these critiques through methodological refinement rather than abandonment of doctrinal foundations. Hutchinson (2015) proposes incorporating interdisciplinary methods into doctrinal research while maintaining its core analytical rigor. This "enriched doctrinarism" recognizes that "the doctrinal method remains essential for generating rigorous legal analysis and guiding doctrinal innovation" (Omar et al., 2025, p. 2115). The approach acknowledges doctrinal research's limitations particularly its inability to assess law's social effects while defending its indispensable role in maintaining legal coherence and providing normative guidance.

Comparative Law Methodology: Functionalism and Beyond

The Functional Method and Its Foundations

Comparative law methodology has evolved significantly since its systematic development in the early twentieth century. The functional approach, most closely associated with the German school of comparative law (particularly Zweigert and Kötz), remains the dominant methodological framework (Zweigert & Kötz, 1998; Michaels, 2006). This approach rests on the premise that legal systems face essentially similar social problems and develop different but functionally equivalent solutions (Siems, 2022; Husa, 2006).

The functional method proceeds through distinct analytical stages: identifying a specific legal problem or social need; examining how different legal systems address that problem; analyzing the functional equivalence or divergence of solutions; and evaluating which approach best achieves the desired social objectives (Van Hoecke, 2011). This methodology enables meaningful comparison across legal systems with different doctrinal structures and historical traditions.

Recent scholarship has both reaffirmed and critiqued functionalism's foundational assumptions. Siems (2022) notes that functional comparison "is considered the classic form of comparative law," yet contemporary comparatists increasingly recognize its limitations (p. 42). The assumption of universal social problems the "common core" hypothesis has been challenged by scholars emphasizing legal and cultural particularity (Legrand, 2023; Glenn, 2007).

Alternative Methodological Approaches

Contemporary comparative law scholarship has developed diverse methodological alternatives to functionalism. Van Hoecke (2011) identifies six commonly employed approaches: (1) the analytical approach, examining legal concepts and terminology across systems; (2) the functional approach, focusing on social problems and legal solutions; (3) the historical approach, tracing legal development over time; (4) the structural approach, analyzing systemic organization and legal families; (5) the law-in-context approach, examining social, political, and economic environments; and (6) the common-core approach, identifying shared principles across legal systems (as cited in Thadikaran, 2024).

The structural approach, associated with the Italian school, analyzes "the overall structure and organization of legal systems and comparing the relationships between different legal institutions and rules" (Thadikaran, 2024, para. 3.2). This method recognizes that disparities in fundamental regulations become less significant when legal systems exhibit sufficient structural similarities to classify them within the same "legal family."

The law-in-context approach, emphasizing social, political, and economic environments, has gained particular prominence in contemporary comparative scholarship (Hantrais, 1999; Örcü, 2006). This methodology evaluates "legal norms and institutions' social, political, and economic environment for the purpose of understanding the way cultural, political, and economic influences shape legal laws and institutions" (Thadikaran, 2024, para. 3.4).

Critical Comparative Law

Recent developments in comparative law methodology include the emergence of critical perspectives. Legrand (2023) has advanced a critical comparative law framework emphasizing "negative critique" the

deconstruction of comparative assumptions rather than the construction of universal legal principles. This approach challenges the possibility of transparent cross-cultural legal understanding and emphasizes the deep cultural embeddedness of legal concepts.

Socio-Legal Studies: Empirical and Interdisciplinary Approaches

The Socio-Legal Turn in Legal Scholarship

Socio-legal studies represent a fundamental methodological transformation in legal research, shifting focus from legal texts to law's social operation. This approach treats law as "a field or aspect of social life" rather than an autonomous system of rules, employing empirical methods to investigate "legal institutions, practices and experiences" (Cotterrell, 2023, p. 4). The socio-legal movement emerged from legal realism's critique of formalism and has developed into a sophisticated interdisciplinary field integrating sociology, anthropology, political science, and psychology (Twining, 2009; McConville & Chui, 2017).

Recent scholarship emphasizes socio-legal studies' methodological diversity. Mulcahy and Cahill-O'Callaghan (2021) observe that socio-legal work encompasses "advanced empirical legal research" while acknowledging "methodological conservatism within law and society research" (p. S1). This methodological pluralism enables researchers to address questions inaccessible through doctrinal analysis alone, particularly concerning law's implementation, enforcement, and social effects.

Empirical Legal Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Methods

Empirical legal research (ELR) constitutes the methodological core of contemporary socio-legal studies. Leeuw and Schmeets (2016) define ELR as research "based on the collection and analysis of data" rather than purely theoretical or doctrinal analysis (p. 10). This empirical orientation distinguishes socio-legal research from doctrinal approaches, enabling investigation of "how law works in society" through evidence-based analysis (Bell, 2016, p. 274).

Chui (2017) identifies three principal methodological categories in empirical legal research: quantitative designs employing statistical techniques to analyze quantifiable evidence; qualitative designs focusing on "understanding of the underlying social phenomenon and processes" through observation and communication; and mixed-method approaches integrating both paradigms. William et al. (2024) demonstrate this methodological sophistication in their quantitative analysis of over 750 disability discrimination cases, employing "descriptive statistics, Pearson's chi-square tests, as well as binary and multinomial logistic regression" (p. 57).

The power of empirical research lies in its capacity to generate evidence regarding law's actual effects. As Teitelbaum (as cited in Taxmann, 2025) observes: "If laws are intended to produce certain results, questions about whether they *do* produce the *expected* results, whether they produce *other* results, and whether the identifiable results are as consistent with the reason for law as one might have anticipated, are all important to examine" (para. 6.2, italics original). This empirical orientation enables evidence-based law reform and policy development.

Interdisciplinary Integration

Socio-legal studies' defining characteristic is its integration of legal analysis with social science methodologies. Vick (2004) emphasizes that interdisciplinary research "does not negate or reject the disciplinary knowledge; rather it pre-supposes the existence of various disciplines" (p. 165). This integration occurs at multiple levels: multidisciplinary approaches juxtaposing disciplinary perspectives; interdisciplinary approaches fusing elements into unified analysis; and transdisciplinary approaches transcending traditional disciplinary boundaries (Miller, 2020).

Recent developments highlight the expanding scope of interdisciplinary legal research. The 2024 Approaches to Legal Research conference at the Max Planck Institute in Berlin featured methodologies ranging from legal history and anthropology to economic analysis and empirical research (Max Planck Law, 2024). Engert's presentation on empirical legal research emphasized "the objectivity aimed for in quantitative analysis while acknowledging the challenges of affordability and data availability" (Max Planck Law, 2024, para. 4). Vogenauer's comparative law session demonstrated "the various aims of comparative law, such as legal harmonization and reform," while addressing methodological pitfalls (Max Planck Law, 2024, para. 4).

Nkansah (2024) proposes a systematic framework for interdisciplinary legal research methodology, utilizing "the social science qualitative research methodology paradigm to demonstrate how to interweave or analyze different accounts of law and non-law data into a single narrative of harmony or disharmony" (p. 1). This framework addresses the technical challenge of integrating legal and non-legal data while maintaining analytical rigor.

Critical Evaluation and Synthesis

Comparative Assessment of Methodological Approaches

Each methodological approach examined in this paper offers distinct strengths and faces characteristic limitations. Doctrinal research provides analytical precision, normative coherence, and direct relevance to legal practice, but cannot assess law's social effects or validate its empirical claims (Hutchinson, 2015; Omar et al., 2025). Comparative methodology enables cross-jurisdictional learning and facilitates legal harmonization, yet risks superficiality when functional equivalence is assumed without deep contextual understanding (Legrand, 2023; Siems, 2022). Socio-legal studies generate empirical evidence of law's operation and effects, but may lack normative direction and practical applicability to legal decision-making (Cownie et al., 2014).

These limitations are not merely incidental weaknesses but structural features arising from each approach's epistemological foundations. Doctrinal research's internal perspective necessarily excludes external evaluation; comparative law's search for equivalence may obscure important differences; socio-legal empiricism's descriptive focus may neglect normative questions. Recognizing these structural limitations is essential for appropriate methodological selection and integration.

Toward Methodological Pluralism

Contemporary legal scholarship increasingly recognizes that complex legal problems require methodological pluralism the strategic integration of multiple approaches. Deplano et al. (2024) argue that "engaging with a plurality of disciplines and their methodologies enriches our understanding of EU law in mutually beneficial ways" (p. 1). This pluralism is not methodological relativism but a principled recognition that different research questions require different methodological tools.

Hutchinson (2015) proposes a framework for "incorporating interdisciplinary methods in reforming the law" while maintaining doctrinal rigor. This approach recognizes that "the doctrinal method remains essential" for normative analysis, while empirical methods provide necessary evidence regarding law's effects (p. 130). The integration of comparative methodology further enables learning from other jurisdictions' experiences.

The Max Planck Law (2024) conference's roundtable discussion on "the necessity and limits of interdisciplinarity in legal research" highlighted both the potential and challenges of methodological integration. Participants recognized that while interdisciplinary approaches broaden methodological horizons, "they may not immediately apply" to all research projects, suggesting the need for strategic methodological selection (Max Planck Law, 2024, para. 6).

A Synthesized Framework

Based on this critical analysis, this paper proposes a synthesized framework for legal research that preserves the strengths of doctrinal, comparative, and socio-legal approaches while mitigating their limitations. This framework operates at three levels:

First, **foundational doctrinal analysis** provides the normative structure and legal precision necessary for any rigorous legal research. This level involves systematic analysis of relevant legal texts, identification of doctrinal gaps or ambiguities, and clarification of normative implications.

Second, **comparative contextualization** situates doctrinal analysis within broader legal frameworks, examining how other jurisdictions address similar problems and identifying potential solutions. This level requires careful attention to contextual differences that may limit direct transplantation of foreign approaches.

Third, **empirical validation** assesses the practical effects of legal rules and institutions, generating evidence regarding implementation, enforcement, and social impact. This level enables evidence-based evaluation of doctrinal proposals and comparative insights.

This synthesized framework does not mandate uniform application across all research projects. Rather, it provides a flexible structure within which researchers can emphasize particular approaches based on research questions, resource constraints, and practical objectives. The framework's value lies in its explicit recognition that comprehensive legal research requires multiple methodological perspectives.

Conclusion

The methodological foundations of legal research are undergoing significant transformation as traditional doctrinal approaches increasingly integrate with comparative and socio-legal methodologies. This paper has critically examined these three principal approaches, demonstrating their distinct contributions and inherent limitations. Doctrinal research maintains its essential role in providing normative coherence and analytical precision, while comparative methodology offers crucial tools for cross-jurisdictional learning, and socio-legal studies generate indispensable empirical evidence of law's social operation.

The central argument of this paper is that methodological pluralism strategically synthesizing doctrinal, comparative, and socio-legal approaches provides the most robust framework for contemporary legal research. This synthesis is not merely an academic preference but a practical necessity for addressing the complex legal challenges of globalization, technological change, and social transformation. As legal scholarship continues to evolve, researchers must develop methodological sophistication that enables appropriate approach selection and effective integration across methodological boundaries.

Future developments in legal research methodology will likely emphasize enhanced interdisciplinary collaboration, greater methodological transparency, and increased integration of empirical evidence into doctrinal analysis. The New Legal Realism movement's twentieth anniversary in 2024 marked not merely a milestone but a transition to new methodological frontiers incorporating critical perspectives and attention to inequality and identity (American Bar Foundation, 2025). These developments promise to enrich legal scholarship while maintaining the rigorous analytical standards that distinguish academic legal research from mere opinion or advocacy.

The methodological foundations examined in this paper doctrinal, comparative, and socio-legal will continue to evolve in response to changing legal and social conditions. However, their essential contributions to legal knowledge production remain constant: doctrinal analysis ensures normative coherence; comparative methodology enables contextual learning; socio-legal studies provide empirical grounding. The challenge for contemporary legal researchers lies not in choosing among these approaches but in developing the methodological sophistication to integrate them effectively in pursuit of rigorous, relevant, and impactful legal scholarship.

References

- American Bar Foundation. (2025). *New Legal Realism at twenty: Rethinking law in a changing world*. <https://www.americanbarfoundation.org/new-legal-realism-at-twenty-rethinking-law-in-a-changing-world/>
- Bell, F. (2016). Empirical research in law. *Griffith Law Review*, 25(2), 262–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10383441.2016.1238901>
- Bhaghamma, G. (2023). A comparative analysis of doctrinal and non-doctrinal legal research. *ILE Journal of Governance and Policy Review*, 1–15. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373632259>
- Cotterrell, R. (2023). *A socio-legal quest: From jurisprudence to sociology of law and back again*. Queen Mary University of London, School of Law. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4622400
- Cownie, F., Bradney, A., & Burton, M. (2014). Socio-legal studies: A challenge to the doctrinal approach. In D. Watkins & M. Burton (Eds.), *Research methods in law* (2nd ed., pp. 34–52). Routledge.
- Deplano, R., Gentile, G., Lonardo, L., & et al. (2024). *Introduction to interdisciplinary research methods in EU law*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802205862>
- Glenn, H. P. (2007). *Legal traditions of the world: Sustainable diversity in law* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1994). *The concept of law* (2nd ed.). Clarendon Press.
- Husa, J. (2006). Methodology of comparative law today: From paradoxes to flexibility. *Revue Internationale de Droit Comparé*, 58(4), 1095–1117.

- Hutchinson, T. (2013). Doctrinal research: Researching the jury. In D. Watkins & M. Burton (Eds.), *Research methods in law* (pp. 15–41). Routledge.
- Hutchinson, T. (2015). The doctrinal method: Incorporating interdisciplinary methods in reforming the law. *Deakin Law Review*, 20(1), 130–145. <https://doi.org/10.21153/dlr2015vol20no1art70>
- Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review*, 17(1), 83–119. <https://doi.org/10.21153/dlr2012vol17no1art70>
- Leeuw, F. L., & Schmeets, H. (2016). *Empirical legal research: A guidance book for lawyers, legislators and regulators*. Springer.
- Legrand, P. (2023). *Comparative law and the task of negative critique*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003161899>
- Majeed, N., Hilal, A., & Khan, A. N. (2023). Doctrinal research in law: Meaning, scope and methodology. *Bulletin of Business and Economics*, 12(4), 559–563. <https://bbejournal.com/BBE/article/view/666>
- Max Planck Law. (2024). *Exploring approaches to legal research, Berlin 2024*. <https://law.mpg.de/news/exploring-approaches-to-legal-research-berlin-2024/>
- McConville, M., & Chui, W. H. (Eds.). (2017). *Research methods for law* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.
- Michaels, R. (2006). Comparative law and economics. In J. M. Smits (Ed.), *Elgar encyclopedia of comparative law* (pp. 123–138). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Miller, R. C. (2020). Interdisciplinarity—Its meaning and consequences. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of international studies*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.92>
- Mulcahy, L., & Cahill-O'Callaghan, R. (2021). Introduction: Socio-legal methodologies. *Journal of Law and Society*, 48(S1), S1–S12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12342>
- Nkansah, L. A. (2024). *A framework for an interdisciplinary legal research methodology: A proposed step by step approach*. University of Hong Kong, Centre for Interdisciplinary Legal Studies. <https://cils.law.hku.hk/>
- Omar, N., Raof, N. A., Othman, R., Pauzi, S. F. M., & et al. (2025). Doctrinal legal research methodology in corporate tax governance studies: Strengths, critiques, and balanced reflections. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(10), 2107–2115. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91002>
- Pound, R. (1910). Law in books and law in action. *American Law Review*, 44, 12–36.
- Siems, M. M. (2022). *Comparative law* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108892766>
- Srivastava, A. K. (2024). Chapter 6: Historical legal research. In A. K. Srivastava (Ed.), *Legal research methodology* (pp. 99–112). Satyam Law International.
- Taxmann. (2025). Socio-legal research—Meaning, methods, challenges. *Taxmann*. <https://www.taxmann.com/post/blog/socio-legal-research>
- Thadikaran, M. (2024). Law comparison as a research method in legal studies, and its importance in promoting uniformity in legal systems. In *Arbitration and international trade in the digital era* (pp. 1–20). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-56121-4_42
- Twining, W. (2009). *General jurisprudence: Understanding law from a global perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van Hoecke, M. (2011). *Methodologies of legal research: Which kind of method for what kind of discipline?* Hart Publishing.
- Van Hoecke, M. (2015). Methodology of comparative legal research. *Law and Method*, 5, 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.5553/rem/.000010>
- Vick, D. W. (2004). Interdisciplinarity and the discipline of law. *Journal of Law and Society*, 31(2), 163–193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2004.00294.x>
- Wheeler, S. (2020). Socio-legal studies in 2020. *Journal of Law and Society*, 47(S1), S1–S15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12267>
- William, L., Corby, S., & Pauksztat, B. (2024). Research methods: Our approach to socio-legal research. In *Claiming disability discrimination* (pp. 57–73). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-74387-0_4

Zweigert, K., & Kötz, H. (1998). *An introduction to comparative law* (3rd ed., T. Weir, Trans.). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1969)