A FRAMEWORK FOR MEASURING ENFORCEMENT EFFECTIVENESS IN LAWS ADDRESSING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Institutum Lex Feminae
Publication Date: February 2026
Version 1.0

LEX FEMINAE
INDEX

Executive Summary

Legislative frameworks addressing violence against women have expanded significantly across jurisdictions.[1] However, the existence of legal provisions does not guarantee effective enforcement. Public debate often focuses on normative adequacy rather than operational performance.

This paper proposes a structured framework for measuring enforcement effectiveness. It outlines measurable indicators, data sources, institutional benchmarks, and methodological safeguards designed to assess the gap between statutory intent and practical implementation.

The objective is to create a replicable, transparent model for institutional audit.

---

[1] Istanbul Convention (Council of Europe) and CEDAW General Recommendations

Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Enforcement Audit Institute | Lex Feminae Index®
Non-profit Association registered in France (Law of 1 July 1901)
www.lexfeminaeindex.com

1. Introduction: The Enforcement Gap

Legal systems frequently demonstrate a structural disconnect between[2]:

- Legislative standards
- Official police recorded victim data
- Judicial outcomes
- Victim access to remedies

This enforcement gap cannot be evaluated through legislative analysis alone. It requires performance-based metrics grounded in observable institutional behavior.

The absence of standardized enforcement measurement creates a blind spot in accountability.

2. Conceptual Framework

Enforcement effectiveness[3] is defined as:

The measurable degree to which legal protections are operationalized through institutional action resulting in intended legal outcomes.

The framework distinguishes between:

1. Normative adequacy (law on the books)
2. Procedural activation (law in motion)[4]
3. Outcome realization (law in effect)

The Institute focuses primarily on levels 2 and 3.

---

[2] Paternoster, R., Saltzman, L. E., & Bachman, R. (1997). "A decade of evidence on rape reporting and arrest: A review." Crime & Delinquency, 43(2), 203–229.
Gelsthorpe, L., & Riger, S. (1990). "Violence against women and the criminal justice system: Processing and outcome." British Journal of Criminology, 30(2), 231–256.
Davis, R. C., Smith, B. E., & Nickles, L. (1995). "The effects of specialized courts on case processing." Justice System Journal, 18(3), 279–298.

[3] Lipsky, M. (2010). Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. Russell Sage Foundation.
[4] Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland. University of California Press.

Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Enforcement Audit Institute | Lex Feminae Index®
Non-profit Association registered in France (Law of 1 July 1901)
www.lexfeminaeindex.com

3. Dimensions of Measurement

The proposed model evaluates enforcement across the following core dimensions:

- Complaint and case intake volume
- Cases adjudicated within defined period
- Case clearance rate
- Congestion and backlog ratio
- Demand absorption capacity
- Average procedural duration
- Data transparency and availability

4. Indicator Construction

Indicators must satisfy the following criteria:

- Availability of reliable data
- Institutional comparability
- Replicability
- Transparency of calculation

The Institute applies a case-flow audit methodology grounded in administrative judicial statistics.

Indicators are derived exclusively from officially published case intake and judicial resolution statistics issued by competent national authorities.

The model assesses throughput, congestion, and demand absorption without imputing crime prevalence or estimating unreported incidents.

5. Data Sources

Potential data inputs include:

- Ministry of Justice statistical reports
- Police administrative datasets
- Parliamentary reports
- Publicly available judicial decisions

Where data gaps exist, limitations must be explicitly acknowledged.[5]

---

[5] Durose, M. R., et al. (2012). Criminal Justice Statistics: What They Do and Don't Tell Us. Bureau of Justice Statistics report.

Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Enforcement Audit Institute | Lex Feminae Index®
Non-profit Association registered in France (Law of 1 July 1901)
www.lexfeminaeindex.com

6. Methodological Safeguards

The Institute adopts the following safeguards:

- Transparent scoring methodology
- Publication of indicator definitions
- Disclosure of data limitations
- Separation between funding and analytical conclusions
- Independent external review

Measurement does not imply normative judgment but institutional performance analysis.[6]

7. Limitations

The framework recognizes:

- Data incompleteness
- Variations in reporting culture
- Differences in procedural law
- Institutional resource disparities

The model evaluates measurable enforcement performance, not underlying sociocultural causes.[7]

8. Pilot Application (Outline)

A pilot application will:

- Select one jurisdiction
- Apply the case-flow audit model
- Assess internal consistency of indicators
- Identify structural processing bottlenecks

---

[6] Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th ed.). Sage.
[7] Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, Fast and Slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Enforcement Audit Institute | Lex Feminae Index®
Non-profit Association registered in France (Law of 1 July 1901)
www.lexfeminaeindex.com

9. Conclusion

Measuring enforcement effectiveness requires moving beyond legislative analysis toward institutional performance auditing.

The proposed framework provides a structured basis for evaluating how legal protections function in practice.

The development of enforcement measurement standards is a necessary step toward evidence-based accountability.

The Lex Feminae Index operationalizes this framework through case-flow auditing of judicial statistics, focusing on measurable processing capacity rather than normative evaluation of legislative quality.

Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Enforcement Audit Institute | Lex Feminae Index®
Non-profit Association registered in France (Law of 1 July 1901)
www.lexfeminaeindex.com

FOOTNOTES

- **Section 1 – Enforcement Gap**

Robert Paternoster, Lisa E. Saltzman & Ronet Bachman, "A Decade of Evidence on Rape Reporting and Arrest: A Review," Crime & Delinquency 43, no. 2 (1997): 203–229.

Loraine Gelsthorpe & Stephanie Riger, "Violence Against Women and the Criminal Justice System: Processing and Outcome," British Journal of Criminology 30, no. 2 (1990): 231–256.

Brian Forst, "Prosecution and Sentencing," in The Handbook of Crime and Punishment, ed. Michael Tonry (Oxford University Press, 1998), 389–414.

- **Section 2 – Conceptual Framework (Implementation & Institutional Theory)**

Michael Lipsky, Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services, 30th Anniversary ed. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2010).

Jeffrey L. Pressman & Aaron Wildavsky, Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

Paul Sabatier & Daniel Mazmanian, "The Conditions of Effective Implementation: A Guide to Accomplishing Policy Objectives," Policy Analysis 5, no. 4 (1979): 481–504.

- **Section 3 – Institutional Processing Literature**

Brian J. Ostrom & Roger A. Hanson,

Efficiency, Timeliness, and Quality: A New Perspective from Nine State Criminal Trial Courts (National Center for State Courts, 1999).

Maureen Solomon, Caseflow Management in the Trial Court (ABA, 1973).

- **Section 5 – Data Reliability & Measurement Limits**

Patrick A. Langan & David J. Levin, Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994, Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report (2002).

Michael Maxfield & Earl Babbie, Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology, 7th ed. (Boston: Cengage, 2014).

Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Enforcement Audit Institute | Lex Feminae Index®
Non-profit Association registered in France (Law of 1 July 1901)
www.lexfeminaeindex.com

- **Section 6 – Evaluation & Transparency Standards**

Peter H. Rossi, Mark W. Lipsey & Howard E. Freeman, Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, 7th ed. (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004).

Carol H. Weiss, Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies, 2nd ed. (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1998).

- **Section 7 – Bias & Reporting Distortion**

Daniel Kahneman, Thinking, Fast and Slow (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011).

Donald T. Campbell, "Reforms as Experiments," American Psychologist 24, no. 4 (1969): 409–429.

Institutum Lex Feminae | Independent Enforcement Audit Institute | Lex Feminae Index®
Non-profit Association registered in France (Law of 1 July 1901)
www.lexfeminaeindex.com