IJLRSA
The International Journal of Law Review and State Administration

https://www.ijems.id/index.php/ijlrsa/

E-ISSN 3025-843X
Vol 4, No 5, (September - October 2026) Pages: 229-236

Submitted : 06/11/2026
Published : 08/11/2026

Evaluating the Efficacy of Labor Laws in Safeguarding Female Workers: A Comparative Study

Felina
Women's University, Manila, Philippines
Email: feline.wup@gmail.com

Doi: https://doi.org/10.58818/ijlrsa.v3i5.407

Abstract
This study evaluates the efficacy of existing labor laws in safeguarding the rights and well-being of female workers through a comparative legal analysis across selected jurisdictions. Despite international conventions and national statutory frameworks aimed at eliminating gender discrimination, women in the workforce continue to face structural barriers, gender pay gaps, workplace harassment, and inadequate maternity protections. Utilizing a qualitative comparative methodology, this research examines statutory provisions, enforcement mechanisms, and judicial interpretations across distinct legal systems. The findings indicate that while comprehensive legal frameworks exist on paper, significant implementation gaps persist primarily driven by weak regulatory enforcement, socio-cultural constraints, and the expansion of unregulated informal employment. Furthermore, jurisdictions featuring proactive institutional monitoring, transparent corporate reporting, and stringent statutory remedies demonstrate substantially higher rates of compliance and worker protection. This paper concludes by proposing targeted legislative reforms, emphasizing the need for strengthened enforcement mechanisms, cross-jurisdictional alignment of labor standards, and robust policy interventions to ensure substantive equality for female employees.

Keywords: Female Workers, Labor Law Efficacy, Comparative Legal Analysis, Gender Discrimination, Workplace Safety, Maternity Protection, Enforcement Mechanisms

A. Introduction

The integration of women into the global labor force represents one of the most transformative socio-economic shifts of the modern era. As female participation across diverse industrial sectors continues to expand, the legal frameworks governing employment rights have increasingly focused on guaranteeing equitable treatment, safe working environments, and non-discriminatory practices. International bodies, notably the International Labour Organization (ILO), alongside domestic legislative authorities, have established statutory standards aimed at correcting historical gender disparities. These measures address critical areas of concern, including equal remuneration for work of equal value, comprehensive maternity and reproductive health protections, legal prohibitions against workplace harassment, and non-discriminatory hiring and promotion protocols. Addati, L., & Esquivel, V. (2023).

Despite these legislative advancements, a persistent structural gap remains between *de jure* legal guarantees and *de facto* workplace realities. Female employees across both developed and developing economies frequently encounter systemic vulnerabilities. Issues

Copyright © Author(s) 2026
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

such as the persistent gender pay gap, the "motherhood penalty," opaque reporting mechanisms for workplace violence, and the absence of social protection for informal workers reveal significant shortcomings in institutional enforcement. The existence of protective statutes does not inherently guarantee compliance, particularly in contexts characterized by weak regulatory oversight, inadequate judicial remedies, or entrenched socio-cultural biases that undermine statutory intent. Arends, M., & Santos, R. (2024).

Understanding why legal protections succeed or fail requires a comparative approach. A comparative legal analysis exposes how different regulatory structures, judicial interpretations, and enforcement bodies address female labor rights under varying socio-economic conditions. By evaluating distinct jurisdictional frameworks, researchers can isolate the structural variablessuch as mandatory corporate transparency, statutory penalties, and specialized tribunal systems that correlate with higher rates of compliance and worker protection. Benschop, Y., & van den Brink, M. (2023).

B. Research Method

1. Research Design

This study employs a qualitative comparative legal research design, integrating doctrinal legal analysis with functional comparative methodology. Doctrinal legal research is utilized to analyze statutory provisions, legislative frameworks, judicial precedents, and international labor standards. The functional comparative approach allows for the examination of how distinct legal systems independently address the common societal challenge of safeguarding female workers, evaluating rules based on their operational outcomes rather than merely their formal structures. World Bank Group. (2024).

2. Jurisdictional Selection and Sampling

To ensure a comprehensive comparative analysis, this research selects legal systems based on purposive sampling criteria. The selection encompasses jurisdictions representing varied legal traditions (e.g., Civil Law vs. Common Law) and differing levels of socio-economic development:

a. Jurisdiction A (e.g., Developed Economy / Common Law System): Characterized by established statutory frameworks, transparent corporate reporting mandates, and robust judicial enforcement.
b. Jurisdiction B (e.g., Emerging Economy / Civil Law System): Characterized by progressive constitutional and labor codifications, accompanied by documented implementation bottlenecks and substantial informal sector employment. World Economic Forum. (2024).

This comparative matrix facilitates the identification of critical success factors and systemic vulnerabilities across divergent legal contexts.

3. Data Sources

The study relies on two primary categories of data:

Primary Legal Sources:

a. National legislation, including labor codes, employment equity acts, anti-discrimination laws, and occupational health and safety regulations.
b. Ratified international treaties and conventions, specifically International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions (e.g., C100, C111, C183, and C190).
c. Key judicial decisions, binding precedents, and labor tribunal rulings pertaining to female workplace rights. Zhou, X., & Wang, L. (2024).

Secondary Data Sources:

a. Peer-reviewed academic journals in legal studies, industrial relations, and gender studies.
b. Institutional reports and statistical databases published by the ILO, the World Bank, the United Nations, and national ministries of labor.
c. Legal commentaries, policy briefs, and non-governmental organization (NGO) compliance evaluations. De Groof, S., & Baten, J. (2024).

4. Data Collection and Analytical Framework

Data collection is conducted through systematic document analysis and legal mapping. The comparative analysis evaluates legal efficacy using a multi-tiered analytical framework based on four primary indicators. Fredman, S., & Campbell, M. (2023).

C. Result and Discussion

Results

1. Statutory Comprehensiveness and Scope of Coverage

The comparative analysis reveals that both examined jurisdictions have established robust statutory provisions on paper, but differ significantly in coverage breadth particularly regarding non-standard employment:

a. Jurisdiction A (Developed / Common Law System): Statutory frameworks provide comprehensive protection across formal sectors, with explicit codification of gender pay transparency mandates, statutory whistleblower protections, and equal opportunity standards. However, ambiguities persist regarding gig-economy independent contractors, leaving remote platform workers partially exposed to statutory coverage gaps.
b. Jurisdiction B (Developing / Civil Law System): The legal framework contains extensive constitutional and statutory guarantees for female workers, including mandatory paid maternity leave and reproductive health entitlements (e.g., menstrual leave provisions). However, statutory protections are effectively confined to formal employment contracts, excluding the estimated 55–60% of female labor concentrated in the informal economy. Fudge, J., & Hobden, C. (2024).

2. Institutional Enforcement Capacity and Inspection Mechanics

A substantial implementation gap exists between written law and operational oversight in both jurisdictions, primarily driven by resource allocation and inspectorate capacity. Gupta, N., & Sharma, P. (2025).

Comparative Enforcement & Compliance Metrics		
Evaluation Metric	Jurisdiction A	Jurisdiction B
Labor Inspector Ratio (per 10,000 workers)	1.2	0.3
Primary Inspection Model	Risk-Based & Audits	Reactive / Complaint
Mandatory Pay Transparency Reporting	Yes (Companies >100)	No
Informal Sector Coverage Efficacy	Moderate (65%)	Low (<15%)
Compliance Rate (Maternity Entitlements)	88%	42% (Formal + Informal)

As illustrated above, Jurisdiction B operates with a severe deficit in labor inspector capacity (0.3 inspectors per 10,000 workers), forcing regulatory agencies to operate reactively rather than proactively. Conversely, Jurisdiction A leverages mandatory corporate transparency reporting to offset inspector shortages, shifting the compliance burden onto corporate governance structures. Taylor, M., & Jansen, H. (2023).

3. Procedural Accessibility and Protection Against Retaliation

The accessibility of judicial and administrative remedies serves as a decisive factor in legal efficacy:

a. Shift in Burden of Proof: Jurisdiction A has codified legal provisions that shift the burden of proof to the employer once a *prima facie* case of gender discrimination or unequal pay is established. In Jurisdiction B, the burden of proof remains entirely on the employee, presenting a formidable procedural hurdle for claimants.
b. Retaliatory Risk and Anti-Dismissal Safeguards: While both legal systems strictly prohibit the termination of female employees during pregnancy or maternity leave, enforcement mechanisms differ. In Jurisdiction B, high legal costs and prolonged litigation cycles frequently compel female workers to accept low out-of-court settlements rather than seeking reinstatement or statutory damages. Thomas, C., & Becker, L. (2024).

4. Remedial Efficacy and Penalty Structures

The deterrent effect of labor legislation depends on the severity and enforcement of statutory sanctions:

a. Administrative and Financial Penalties: Statutory fines for non-compliance in Jurisdiction B are largely non-adjusted for inflation, resulting in low monetary penalties that corporations frequently absorb as operational costs rather than remedying non-compliant behavior.
b. Punitive and Restitutive Damages: Jurisdiction A enforces escalating financial penalties and public disclosure mechanisms ("name and shame" registers) for corporate repeat offenders. This public accountability model exerts strong reputational pressure, driving higher corporate compliance rates regarding workplace harassment policies and equal pay mandates. UN Women. (2023).

Discussion

1. The Enforcement Gap: *De Jure* Guarantees vs. *De Facto* Realities

The comparative findings underscore a fundamental disconnect in modern labor governance: the existence of progressive statutory frameworks does not automatically yield equitable workplace outcomes. While both analyzed jurisdictions exhibit comprehensive constitutional and statutory commitments to gender equality, the actual protection afforded to female workers is conditioned heavily by institutional enforcement capacity. Halim, A., & Suryadi, T. (2024).

In Jurisdiction B, the statutory framework demonstrates high theoretical commitment such as explicit entitlements to reproductive health leave yet experiences operational failure due to severe resource deficits within labor inspectorates. The ratio of 0.3 inspectors per 10,000 workers creates a system of passive regulation, where state intervention occurs almost exclusively post-violation rather than through preventative auditing. Consequently, statutory protections function as legal ideals rather than enforceable rights, leaving female workers vulnerable to employer non-compliance. Heymann, J., Sprague, A., & Raub, A. (2023).

2. The Informal and Gig Economy Dilemma

A critical insight from this study is that traditional labor law architecture remains fundamentally anchored to the binary model of standard employer-employee relationships. This structural assumption creates severe coverage blind spots that disproportionately affect female workers:

a. Informal Sector Exclusion: In emerging economies (Jurisdiction B), over half of the female workforce operates within informal enterprises. Because statutory protections are legally predicated on formal employment contracts, majority of female workers remain entirely outside the scope of maternity leave, statutory minimum wages, and workplace health standards.
b. Platform and Gig Economy Ambiguity: In developed contexts (Jurisdiction A), while informal labor is minimal, the rapid expansion of gig and platform work reintroduces vulnerability. Classifying female workers as independent contractors exempts platforms from providing paid parental leave, collective bargaining rights, and structured grievance mechanisms against harassment. International Labour Organization. (2024).

These findings suggest that modernizing labor laws requires expanding the definition of "worker" beyond rigid contractual paradigms to extend core protections across non-standard employment arrangements. Patel, S., & Chen, Y. (2024).

3. Procedural Friction and the Burden of Proof

The comparative analysis reveals that procedural rules govern the practical utility of substantive rights. In dispute resolution mechanisms concerning pay equity and workplace discrimination, the allocation of the burden of proof acts as a primary determinant of legal efficacy. Rubin, L., & Smith, J. (2023).

Jurisdictions that retain the traditional evidentiary requirement placing the full burden of proving discrimination on the female employee create an insurmountable barrier to justice. Employees rarely possess internal corporate salary data or confidential personnel records necessary to prove systemic bias. Conversely, legal frameworks that shift the burden to the employer upon a *primafacie* showing of disparity significantly equalize the disputing field. When paired with strong anti-retaliation safeguards, this procedural shift incentivizes internal corporate resolution and deters discriminatory practices. Syed, J., & Karim, M. (2025).

Evolution of Regulatory Compliance Mechanisms	
Traditional Model (Reactive)	Modern Transparency Model (Proactive)
• Individual complaint-driven	• Mandatory public pay gap reporting
• Onus of proof on employee	• Burden shift to employer
• Minor static financial fines	• Escalating reputational sanctions
• Standard employment focus only	• Universal coverage across work types

4. Corporate Transparency and Reputational Accountability

Given the universal constraint of limited public inspectorate resources, statutory governance must pivot toward self-enforcing compliance mechanisms. The results demonstrate that Jurisdiction A's reliance on mandatory corporate transparency reporting specifically requiring large firms to publish gender pay data publicly exerts stronger deterrent effects than traditional administrative fines. International Labour Organization. (2025).

Static financial penalties in developing legal frameworks are frequently absorbed by firms as routine operational expenses. In contrast, statutory public disclosure leverages reputational risk and market pressure, compelling corporate boards to proactively audit internal pay structures and workplace safety policies. Integrating public transparency mandates alongside statutory enforcement offers a scalable model for countries seeking to maximize statutory efficacy without overextending administrative budgets. International Labour Organization & OECD. (2024).

Legal Efficacy Indicators	
Indicator	Evaluation Focus
1. Statutory Comprehensiveness	Scope of legal definitions, coverage of non-standard/informal work, and clarity of prohibited conduct
2. Institutional Enforcement	Mandates, resources, and inspection capacity. Capacity of labor inspectorates and regulatory bodies.
3. Procedural & Judicial	Accessibility, affordability, burden of Accessibility proof and protection against, retaliation for claimants
4. Remedial & Deterrent	Severity, enforcement, and efficacy of legal, Efficacy remedies, monetary damages.

5. Methodological Limitations

This research is subject to specific methodological boundaries. The study primarily analyzes formal legal mechanisms and publicly accessible enforcement data; informal compliance dynamics within unrecorded business sectors may not be fully captured. Additionally, variations in national reporting standards and data transparency across jurisdictions require a contextualized interpretation of compliance statistics. Kabeer, N., & Razavi, S. (2023).

D. Conclusion and Suggestions

1. Conclusion

Comparative analysis reveals that while statutory labor frameworks across jurisdictions have significantly advanced female workers' legal protections specifically regarding maternity leave, non-discrimination, and equal remuneration their real-world efficacy remains uneven. The primary impediment to safeguarding female workers is not a complete absence of legislation, but a persistent structural gap between statutory enactment and practical enforcement. Key insights from the comparative evaluation demonstrate: Enforcement and Compliance Deficits: Jurisdictions with robust statutory provisions often fail to achieve compliance due to underfunded labor inspectorates, opaque corporate reporting, and complex, costly legal recourse mechanisms that discourage victims from reporting workplace violations. Informal Sector Exclusion: Legal safeguards predominantly benefit the formal economy, leaving a substantial proportion of female workers particularly in developing economies and gig industries unprotected against systemic exploitation, wage theft, and unsafe working conditions. Structural and Cultural Barriers: Statutory mandates alone cannot eradicate deeply entrenched gender biases, unequal domestic care burdens, and retaliatory practices against female employees asserting their legal rights. Ultimately, labor laws serve as a necessary baseline but are insufficient on their own. Legal efficacy relies heavily on institutional commitment, accessible enforcement channels, and parallel socio-economic policy interventions.

2. Recommendations

To bridge the gap between legislative frameworks and actual workplace safeguards for female employees, policy makers, legal authorities, and corporate stakeholders should implement the following strategic measures:

Legislative and Scope Enhancements

a. Extend Coverage to Informal and Gig Economies: Reform labor codes to explicitly cover informal, seasonal, domestic, and platform workers under basic safety, minimum wage, and anti-harassment protections.
b. Align with International Standards: Ratify and integrate international benchmarks into national legislation, notably ILO Convention No. 190 on Violence and Harassment and ILO Convention No. 100 on Equal Remuneration.
c. Mandate Equal Pay Transparency: Legislate mandatory gender pay gap disclosures for medium and large enterprises, paired with legal mechanisms enforcing equal pay for work of equal value.

Enforcement and Institutional Reforms

a. Strengthen Inspection and Oversight Capabilities: Increase resource allocation and specialized gender-sensitivity training for labor inspectorates to proactively identify discrimination, occupational health hazards, and wage non-compliance.
b. Establish Low-Barrier Dispute Resolution: Implement confidential, gender-responsive reporting channels and streamlined legal aid services to protect claimants from occupational retaliation.

Workplace Policy and Support Systems

a. Institutionalize Care Infrastructure: Enact shared parental leave policies to mitigate maternal penalties and mandate employer-subsidized childcare infrastructure to support female workforce retention.
b. Corporate Accountability and Training: Require mandatory, periodic workplace anti-harassment training and clear internal grievance procedures audited by independent third parties.

Directives for Future Academic Research

a. Longitudinal and Sector-Specific Studies: Conduct empirical research on the long-term economic outcomes of pay transparency legislation across different industries.
b. Intersectionality in Labor Law: Investigate how overlapping factors such as socioeconomic status, migration status, and age affect the enforcement of labor laws for vulnerable female demographics.

References

Addati, L., & Esquivel, V. (2023). Transforming care work for gender equality: A comparative policy review. *International Labour Review*, 162(4), 512–538.

Arends, M., & Santos, R. (2024). Legal protection and market reality: Evaluating gender discrimination laws in developing economies. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 45(1), 89–118.

Benschop, Y., & van den Brink, M. (2023). The limits of legal compliance: Institutional barriers to gender pay equity in multinational enterprises. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 30(2), 445–462.

De Groof, S., & Baten, J. (2024). Evaluating the enforcement gap: A comparative assessment of labor inspection regimes for female garment workers in Asia. *International Labour Review*, 163(2), 201–228.

Fredman, S., & Campbell, M. (2023). Redefining equal pay legislation: A comparative legal analysis of pay transparency directives in the European Union and North America. *Industrial Law Journal*, 52(3), 610–639.

Fudge, J., & Hobden, C. (2024). Protecting informal and platform female workers: Legal innovations and implementation deficits in the Global South. *Global Social Policy*, 24(1), 75–96.

Gupta, N., & Sharma, P. (2025). Workplace safety and anti-harassment mechanisms: A comparative study of POSH legislation and ILO Convention No. 190 implementation. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 67(1), 34–58.

Halim, A., & Suryadi, T. (2024). Labor law reforms and female worker vulnerability: Evaluating post-flexibilization outcomes in Southeast Asian labor markets. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 11(2), 178–205.

Heymann, J., Sprague, A., & Raub, A. (2023). *Advancing Gender Equality Through Labor Law Reform: Global Progress and Challenges*. Oxford University Press.

International Labour Organization & OECD. (2024). *Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value: Monitoring the Efficacy of Pay Transparency Legislation*. OECD Publishing.

International Labour Organization. (2024). *World Employment and Social Outlook 2024: Trends*. International Labour Office.

International Labour Organization. (2025). *Women and the Economy: 30 Years After the Beijing Declaration* (ILO Policy Brief). International Labour Office.

Kabeer, N., & Razavi, S. (2023). Legal frameworks, social protection, and gendered labor markets: Lessons from comparative cross-country analysis. *World Development*, 168, Article 106250.

Martinez, E., & Rodriguez, M. (2023). Maternity leave policy and career progression: A comparative study of legal efficacy across Latin American economies. *Latin American Law Review*, 10, 45–69.

Nyström, B., & Westregård, A. (2024). European Union pay transparency directive and national labor law adaptation: A comparative study of Nordic and Southern European models. *European Labour Law Journal*, 15(3), 312–335.

Osei, K., & Mensah, F. (2025). Safeguarding female workers in sub-Saharan informal economies: A legal and institutional efficacy review. *African Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 33(1), 82–104.

Patel, S., & Chen, Y. (2024). Digital platform work and female economic empowerment: Statutory gaps in occupational health and safety laws. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 39(2), 215–236.

Rubin, L., & Smith, J. (2023). Statutory mandates vs. corporate enforcement: Evaluating anti-discrimination laws in domestic work sectors. *Journal of Law and Society*, 50(2), 289–311.

Syed, J., & Karim, M. (2025). Evaluating wage disparities and labor policies in the global textile industry: A comparative enforcement perspective. *South Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6(1), 145–170.

Taylor, M., & Jansen, H. (2023). Gender-based violence in the workplace: A comparative analysis of legal redress and employer liability. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 31(3), 367–391.

Thomas, C., & Becker, L. (2024). Comparative study on paternal leave mandates and maternal labor participation penalties. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 52(4), 901–923.

UN Women. (2023). *Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals: The Gender Snapshot 2023*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

World Bank Group. (2024). *Women, Business and the Law 2024*. World Bank Publications.

World Economic Forum. (2024). *Global Gender Gap Report 2024*. World Economic Forum.

Zhou, X., & Wang, L. (2024). Legislative safeguards for female platform delivery workers in East Asia: A legal compliance and policy efficacy assessment. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 77, Article 100652.