



INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PRIVATE
COMMERCIAL AND COMPETITION LAW
(IIPCL - AUSTRIA)

Research Article

© 2026 Elizabeta Imeraj & Flutur Shabani

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Between Normative Progress and Lived Inequality: Rethinking Gender Equality and the Effectiveness of Women’s Rights Protection in Contemporary Legal Orders

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elizabeta Imeraj
“Barleti” University, Tirana, Albania

PhD (C.) Flutur Shabani
“Barleti” University, Tirana, Albania

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/bjir-2026-0010>

Abstract

Despite significant normative advancements in international human rights law, gender inequality remains deeply embedded in both social structures and legal systems across contemporary legal orders. Over the past several decades, international and regional frameworks—such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and related regional human rights instruments—have established comprehensive legal standards aimed at securing gender equality and eliminating discrimination against women. These developments reflect an important normative shift from formal equality toward substantive equality, requiring states not only to guarantee equal treatment in law but also to address the structural conditions that produce and sustain inequality in practice. This paper examines the persistent tension between formal legal progress in women’s rights protection and the continued reality of lived inequality. While women’s rights are now widely recognized within domestic constitutions and international legal regimes, their practical implementation often remains inconsistent, fragmented, or ineffective. As a result, a significant gap persists between the normative promises of international human rights law and the everyday experiences of women, particularly those belonging to marginalized, economically disadvantaged, or socially excluded groups. The paper argues that although international and regional legal frameworks have developed robust and increasingly sophisticated standards for gender equality, their overall effectiveness is significantly undermined by three interrelated factors. First, structural discrimination embedded within legal, political, and economic institutions continues to reproduce unequal outcomes despite formal equality guarantees. Second, weak enforcement mechanisms at both domestic and international levels limit the capacity of legal norms to produce tangible change, particularly where judicial independence, institutional capacity, or

political will is lacking. Third, socio-cultural barriers—including patriarchal norms, gender stereotypes, and discriminatory social practices—restrict women’s ability to access justice and fully exercise their rights. Drawing on international human rights instruments, jurisprudence, and interdisciplinary scholarly literature, the paper critically analyses the gap between law and lived reality and evaluates the extent to which existing legal frameworks effectively protect women’s rights in practice. It highlights how legal protections, while normatively strong, often fail to translate into substantive equality due to institutional and societal constraints that operate beyond formal legal rules.

The paper concludes that achieving meaningful and sustainable gender equality requires more than the formal recognition of rights within legal texts. It demands comprehensive institutional transformation, including strengthened enforcement mechanisms, improved access to justice, and gender-sensitive interpretation of legal norms. In addition, it requires broader socio-cultural change aimed at challenging and transforming the structural and normative foundations of gender inequality. Only through the combined effect of legal reform, institutional strengthening, and cultural transformation can the promise of substantive equality under international human rights law be fully realized.

Keywords: Gender equality; women’s rights; substantive equality; human rights law; structural discrimination; access to justice; legal effectiveness.

1. Introduction

The development of international human rights law reflects significant normative progress in the recognition and protection of women’s rights. Over the past several decades, the international legal system has progressively moved toward the formal consolidation of gender equality as a binding legal principle. Instruments such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and various regional human rights treaties including the European Convention on Human Rights and the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence against Women (Belém do Pará Convention) have established comprehensive legal frameworks aimed at ensuring both formal and substantive gender equality (Charlesworth & Chinkin, 2000; Steiner, Alston, & Goodman, 2008). These frameworks impose obligations on states to eliminate discrimination, adopt affirmative measures where necessary, and ensure effective protection of women’s rights in both public and private spheres.

Despite these significant normative advancements, women across many jurisdictions continue to experience systemic discrimination, gender-based violence, and unequal access to justice. As Fredman (2011) argues, discrimination is not only a matter of individual acts of bias but is also structurally embedded within social, economic, and institutional arrangements that reproduce inequality over time. Similarly, Merry (2006) highlights that although international human rights norms have become increasingly robust, their translation into local legal and social contexts is often uneven, fragmented, and shaped by existing power relations. As a result, the persistence of gender inequality reflects not only gaps in legal protection but also deeper structural and cultural constraints that limit the effectiveness of formal rights.

This disconnect between formal legal equality and lived inequality raises critical questions about the effectiveness of women's rights protection in contemporary legal orders. While legal norms increasingly affirm gender equality as a foundational principle of international law, their implementation in practice often remains inconsistent, selective, or insufficiently enforced (Hathaway, 2002; Merry, 2006). Hathaway (2002) further argues that the impact of international human rights treaties depends heavily on domestic incorporation and political will, meaning that ratification alone does not guarantee meaningful compliance or improved outcomes for rights-holders.

This paper argues that the persistence of gender inequality is not primarily the result of a lack of legal norms or international standards, but rather the failure of legal systems to effectively translate those norms into meaningful social outcomes. In many contexts, formal legal commitments to gender equality coexist with institutional weaknesses, limited access to justice, and socio-cultural barriers that prevent women from fully exercising their rights. As Shelton (2020) emphasizes, the effectiveness of human rights law ultimately depends on enforcement mechanisms, remedies, and institutional capacity to ensure compliance.

2. Normative Progress in Women's Rights Protection

International law has made substantial progress in establishing gender equality as a binding legal norm within the global human rights framework. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) represents the most comprehensive international treaty dedicated specifically to women's rights, obliging states parties to eliminate discrimination against women in political, economic, social, and cultural life. In addition, regional human rights systems such as the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the Inter-American human rights system have developed extensive jurisprudence reinforcing gender equality principles and expanding protections through judicial interpretation (Harris, O'Boyle, & Warbrick, 2018; Steiner, Alston, & Goodman, 2008).

This normative development reflects a broader transformation in international legal thinking about equality. According to Charlesworth and Chinkin (2000), international law has progressively shifted from a narrow conception of formal equality based on identical treatment to a more substantive understanding of equality that recognises the need to address structural disadvantage and systemic discrimination. This evolution is particularly significant in relation to gender equality, as formal equality alone often fails to account for deeply embedded social, economic, and cultural inequalities that disproportionately affect women. As Fredman (2011) further explains, substantive equality requires not only equal treatment but also positive measures to dismantle structural barriers that perpetuate disadvantage.

The recognition of structural discrimination is especially important in understanding how inequality operates indirectly through institutional and societal practices. Feminist legal scholars argue that gender bias is often embedded within legal and administrative systems in ways that are not immediately visible but nonetheless produce unequal

outcomes (Charlesworth & Chinkin, 2000; Merry, 2006). These insights have influenced international jurisprudence and policy development, encouraging a more context-sensitive approach to equality that goes beyond formal legal guarantees.

Furthermore, Shelton (2020) argues that contemporary international human rights law now provides a comprehensive normative framework for gender equality, encompassing obligations to prevent discrimination, protect victims of rights violations, and ensure access to effective remedies. This framework is reinforced by monitoring bodies such as the CEDAW Committee, which issues General Recommendations interpreting state obligations and guiding implementation. Together, these developments reflect a strong global normative consensus on the importance of women's rights and the legal obligation of states to ensure their effective protection.

However, despite this robust normative architecture, scholars such as Hathaway (2002) caution that the effectiveness of international human rights law depends heavily on domestic implementation, political will, and institutional capacity. As a result, the existence of strong legal norms does not automatically translate into substantive equality in practice, highlighting the ongoing gap between legal standards and lived experience.

3. The Gap Between Law and Lived Reality

Despite significant normative progress in international human rights law, a substantial gap persists between formal legal frameworks and the lived experiences of women in many jurisdictions. Although states increasingly recognise gender equality within constitutional and statutory provisions, practical access to justice remains uneven and often exclusionary. Women continue to face a range of structural and institutional barriers, including financial constraints, limited legal awareness, lack of legal representation, language barriers, and institutional bias within judicial and administrative systems (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978; Sanders & Young, 2015). These barriers collectively undermine the ability of legal systems to deliver meaningful protection of women's rights in practice.

Merry (2006) conceptualises this disconnect as "vernacularization," a process through which international human rights norms are translated into local legal and cultural contexts in ways that may significantly alter their meaning and reduce their transformative potential. In this process, global standards such as gender equality and non-discrimination are often reinterpreted through existing social norms, institutional practices, and political constraints. As a result, while legal rights may exist at the normative level, their implementation is frequently inconsistent, partial, or symbolic rather than substantive. This contributes to a persistent gap between law in theory and law in action.

Structural inequality further deepens this gap by embedding disadvantage within the very institutions meant to address it. Fredman (2011) argues that discrimination is not limited to isolated acts of unfair treatment but is instead reproduced through systemic patterns embedded in legal, economic, and social structures, including

family relations, labour markets, and criminal justice systems. Similarly, De Sousa Santos (2002) emphasises that law operates within broader social power relations, meaning that formal equality provisions may fail to produce substantive equality where underlying structural inequalities remain unaddressed. These institutional and structural barriers significantly limit the transformative capacity of law. In addition, Merry (2006) and Fredman (2011) both highlight that intersectional forms of disadvantage, such as those based on gender combined with poverty, ethnicity, or migration status—further restrict women’s access to justice. This reinforces inequality not only in legal outcomes but also in the ability to engage with legal processes in the first place. Consequently, the persistence of gender inequality reflects not merely a gap in legal norms but a deeper failure of legal systems to address the socio-economic and cultural conditions that shape the practical enjoyment of rights.

4. Socio-Cultural Barriers to Gender Equality

Legal reform alone is insufficient to achieve substantive gender equality, as socio-cultural norms often continue to reinforce discriminatory practices even where strong legal protections exist. Despite the formal recognition of women’s rights in international and domestic legal frameworks, deeply rooted patriarchal attitudes persist in shaping societal expectations of gender roles and influencing how laws are interpreted, applied, and enforced in practice. Merry (2006) argues that international human rights norms are frequently reshaped during their translation into local contexts, where they may be adapted to fit existing cultural and institutional frameworks, sometimes weakening their transformative potential.

Similarly, De Sousa Santos (2002) conceptualises law as operating within a broader framework of “sociological legality,” in which the effectiveness of legal norms depends not only on their formal enactment but also on their social legitimacy and cultural acceptance. From this perspective, law is not autonomous from society; rather, it is embedded within social power relations and normative systems. Where significant tensions exist between legal standards and dominant socio-cultural norms, enforcement becomes inconsistent, selective, or symbolic rather than substantive, thereby limiting the real-world impact of legal reforms.

This problem is further reinforced by the persistence of gender-based stigma and structural inequalities that discourage women from accessing legal remedies. In many jurisdictions, women face significant social pressure, fear of retaliation, and cultural stigmatization when seeking justice in cases involving domestic violence, sexual assault, or other forms of gender-based abuse. These barriers not only reduce reporting rates but also weaken the overall effectiveness of legal protection mechanisms (Fredman, 2011; Charlesworth & Chinkin, 2000). As a result, formal legal rights may exist, yet remain underutilized or inaccessible in practice.

In addition, Shelton (2020) emphasises that the effectiveness of human rights protections depends heavily on the interaction between legal norms and domestic institutional frameworks, including courts, law enforcement agencies, and social

welfare systems. Where these institutions reflect or reproduce patriarchal values, the enforcement of women's rights is significantly weakened. Consequently, socio-cultural resistance and institutional bias operate together to undermine the practical realization of gender equality.

Overall, these dynamics demonstrate that achieving meaningful gender equality requires more than legal reform. It necessitates sustained efforts to transform socio-cultural norms, strengthen institutional accountability, and ensure that legal systems are both accessible and responsive to the lived realities of women.

5. Towards Substantive Equality

Achieving effective protection of women's rights requires a fundamental paradigm shift from a purely formal conception of equality toward a substantive model of equality. While formal equality is grounded in the principle of identical treatment under the law, it often fails to account for the structural, historical, and intersectional disadvantages that continue to shape women's lived experiences across different legal systems. Substantive equality, by contrast, requires not only the formal recognition of rights but also proactive, sustained, and context-sensitive measures aimed at dismantling the social, economic, and institutional barriers that reproduce gender-based inequality over time.

According to Charlesworth and Chinkin (2000), substantive equality in international law demands far more than neutral or "blind" legal rules. It requires affirmative action, institutional restructuring, and a gender-sensitive approach to legal interpretation that acknowledges the contextual realities of discrimination. This approach recognises that inequality is often embedded within seemingly neutral laws and practices that produce disparate impacts on women. Similarly, Fredman (2011) argues that equality law must evolve from a narrow model of formal non-discrimination toward a transformative framework that actively challenges systemic disadvantage and promotes equality of outcomes. In this sense, equality is not merely about equal treatment but about achieving genuine social justice through law.

Building on this perspective, Shelton (2020) emphasises that the effectiveness of international human rights law depends significantly on the availability of robust remedies, strong enforcement mechanisms, and effective institutional accountability structures. Without these elements, legal rights risk remaining largely aspirational rather than practically enforceable. This view is reinforced by Shany (2014), who argues that the effectiveness of international legal regimes depends on domestic implementation capacity and the willingness of states to comply with international obligations. Similarly, Hathaway (2002) demonstrates that the ratification of human rights treaties alone does not guarantee improved human rights outcomes unless supported by meaningful domestic enforcement and political commitment.

International human rights standards, particularly those developed under CEDAW and reinforced by treaty monitoring bodies such as the CEDAW Committee and the Human Rights Committee, highlight the importance of state obligations not only to prohibit discrimination but also to adopt positive measures that ensure the full

realisation of women's rights in practice (United Nations, 1979; United Nations Human Rights Committee, 2007). These obligations include legislative reform, institutional strengthening, and the implementation of policies designed to eliminate both direct and indirect discrimination.

In addition, Merry (2006) stresses that legal transformation must be accompanied by broader socio-cultural change, as legal norms alone are insufficient to dismantle deeply embedded gender hierarchies. Law operates within broader cultural and institutional environments that may either support or resist its transformative goals. As a result, education, legal empowerment, and institutional reform are essential components of any meaningful strategy for achieving gender equality. These measures are particularly important for ensuring access to justice for women in marginalised or vulnerable groups, who often face compounded barriers related to poverty, ethnicity, or social exclusion (Fredman, 2011; Merry, 2006).

Ultimately, without addressing underlying structural inequalities and socio-cultural norms, legal frameworks alone cannot deliver meaningful or sustainable gender equality. A holistic and integrated approach is therefore required one that combines legal reform, institutional strengthening, enforcement capacity, and socio-cultural transformation. Only through this multi-dimensional strategy can the effective protection of women's rights be fully realised within contemporary legal orders.

6. Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated that, despite significant normative progress within international human rights law, particularly through instruments such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and regional human rights systems, a substantial and persistent gap remains between formal legal protections and the lived realities of women. While contemporary legal frameworks increasingly articulate gender equality as a binding legal norm, their practical effectiveness is often constrained by structural discrimination embedded within legal, political, and socio-economic institutions, as well as by weak enforcement mechanisms and limited access to effective remedies. These limitations are further compounded by deeply rooted socio-cultural norms that continue to shape gender relations and restrict the full realisation of women's rights in practice (Fredman, 2011; Merry, 2006).

In many jurisdictions, the persistence of gender inequality reflects not a deficiency in normative legal standards but rather the failure of implementation and enforcement structures to translate those standards into meaningful social outcomes. Legal systems may formally prohibit discrimination, yet indirect and systemic forms of inequality often remain unaddressed, particularly where institutional bias, resource constraints, and unequal power relations influence judicial and administrative decision-making. As Shelton (2020) and Shany (2014) emphasise, the effectiveness of international human rights law depends heavily on domestic incorporation, institutional capacity, and the existence of robust accountability mechanisms capable

of ensuring compliance with legal obligations.

Bridging this gap therefore requires more than incremental legal reform. It demands a comprehensive and multi-dimensional transformation that extends beyond legal texts to include institutional redesign, strengthened enforcement mechanisms, and sustained political commitment to equality. Equally important is the need to address socio-cultural attitudes and norms that perpetuate gender hierarchies and undermine the practical application of legal protections. As Charlesworth and Chinkin (2000) argue, achieving substantive equality requires a reconceptualisation of legal neutrality, recognising that apparently neutral rules may reproduce inequality unless actively corrected through gender-sensitive interpretation and structural reform. Ultimately, the realisation of substantive gender equality in contemporary legal orders depends on the integration of legal, institutional, and cultural change. Law alone cannot eradicate entrenched inequality; however, when combined with effective institutions, accessible justice mechanisms, and transformative social policies, it can serve as a powerful instrument for social change. Only through this holistic approach can the promise of international women's rights protection be fully realised in practice, ensuring that formal equality is translated into genuine lived equality.

References

- Cappelletti, M., & Garth, B. (1978). *Access to justice*.
- Charlesworth, H., & Chinkin, C. (2000). *The boundaries of international law: A feminist analysis*. Manchester University Press.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2002). *Toward a new legal common sense*. Butterworths.
- Fredman, S. (2011). *Discrimination law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Harris, D., O'Boyle, M., & Warbrick, C. (2018). *Law of the European Convention on Human Rights* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Hathaway, O. A. (2002). Do human rights treaties make a difference? *Yale Law Journal*, 111(8), 1935–2042.
- Merry, S. E. (2006). *Human rights and gender violence: Translating international law into local justice*. University of Chicago Press.
- Rose-Ackerman, S., & Palifka, B. (2016). *Corruption and government*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sanders, A., & Young, R. (2015). *Criminal justice*. Oxford University Press.
- Shany, Y. (2014). *Assessing the effectiveness of international courts*. Oxford University Press.
- Shelton, D. (2020). *Advanced introduction to international human rights law*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Steiner, H. J., Alston, P., & Goodman, R. (2008). *International human rights in context: Law, politics, morals* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- United Nations. (1979). *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)*.
- United Nations Human Rights Committee. (2007). *General comment No. 32: Article 14: Right to equality before courts and tribunals and to a fair trial*.