



Cultural Pluralism and Legal Recognition: A Qualitative Study of Minority Rights in Globalized Societies

1. Mehran. Nouri*: Department of Cultural Studies, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran. Email: mehran.nouri.int@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)
2. Sina. Asadi: Department of Cultural Studies, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study aimed to explore how minority-rights actors in Tehran understand cultural pluralism, legal recognition, and the transformation of belonging in the context of globalization. A qualitative research design was adopted using semi-structured interviews with 24 participants in Tehran, including minority community members, legal professionals, civil society actors, and cultural-rights stakeholders. Participants were selected purposively through maximum-variation sampling to capture diverse experiences of ethnic, linguistic, religious, and cultural minority-rights issues. Interviews continued until theoretical saturation was achieved. Each interview lasted between 45 and 80 minutes and focused on experiences of legal recognition, institutional access, cultural identity, discrimination, and transnational rights discourses. Interviews were audio-recorded with consent, transcribed verbatim, anonymized, and analyzed using thematic analysis. NVivo software was used to organize transcripts, develop codes, compare patterns, and construct categories. Trustworthiness was enhanced through prolonged engagement with the data, peer review of codes, memo writing, and participant validation of selected interpretations. Four main categories emerged: legal recognition as symbolic and administrative visibility; conditional belonging and unequal citizenship experiences; negotiation between state law, community norms, and individual rights; and globalization as both an empowering and contested source of minority-rights discourse. Participants described recognition not only as constitutional or statutory protection, but also as everyday institutional responsiveness in education, courts, media, and public administration. They also emphasized that formal equality may remain incomplete when minority identities are tolerated privately but insufficiently represented publicly. The study suggests that minority rights in globalized societies require more than abstract equality. Effective cultural pluralism depends on participatory legal recognition, accessible institutions, protection against discrimination, and safeguards for vulnerable persons within minority communities. Globalization expands rights vocabulary, but local legitimacy remains essential for sustainable legal adaptation.

Keywords: cultural pluralism; legal recognition; minority rights; globalization; legal pluralism; qualitative study; Tehran.

How to cite this article:

Nouri, M. & Asadi, S. (2025). Cultural Pluralism and Legal Recognition: A Qualitative Study of Minority Rights in Globalized Societies. *Contemporary Issues in Law, Culture, and Globalization*, 1(2), 44-53. <https://doi.org/10.61838/cileg.1.2.5>

© 2025 the authors. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

Introduction

Globalization has intensified the movement of people, ideas, legal norms, media narratives, and rights-based vocabularies across national borders. As a result, contemporary societies are increasingly required to negotiate the relationship between

cultural plurality and legal unity. Minority rights are located at the center of this negotiation because they raise fundamental questions about equality, citizenship, institutional inclusion, and the limits of state neutrality. In many legal systems, citizenship is formally defined in universal terms, yet minority groups often experience law through culturally specific encounters with language policy, religious regulation, public administration, education, family norms, and access to justice. Therefore, the issue is not merely whether minorities are legally equal in abstract terms, but whether law recognizes the cultural conditions through which equality becomes meaningful in practice.

Theoretical debates on multiculturalism have long questioned whether liberal legal systems can accommodate group-based claims without undermining individual rights or national cohesion. Kymlicka (1995) argues that minority rights may be compatible with liberal democracy when they protect cultural membership as a context of individual autonomy. His distinction between external protections and internal restrictions remains important: legal recognition may protect minorities against domination by the majority, but it should not authorize coercive practices within minority communities. Taylor (1994) similarly frames recognition as a moral and political necessity, arguing that misrecognition can inflict harm by denying individuals and groups a secure public identity. From this perspective, recognition is not a symbolic luxury; it is connected to dignity, social participation, and the legitimacy of legal institutions.

However, recognition is also contested. Fraser (2000) warns that recognition politics can become problematic when it is detached from redistribution, institutional justice, and structural inequality. In her view, cultural recognition should not replace attention to economic and legal marginalization. This critique is especially relevant for minority-rights debates because cultural groups may seek language rights, religious accommodation, or public representation while also facing unequal access to employment, education, housing, administrative services, and political participation. Thus, minority rights must be understood through the intersection of identity, institutional power, and material opportunity.

The concept of cultural pluralism provides a broader framework for analyzing these tensions. Parekh (2000) argues that multicultural societies require an intercultural political order in which no single cultural tradition monopolizes the definition of citizenship. Benhabib (2002) similarly rejects the idea that cultures are fixed, bounded, and internally homogeneous. Instead, she emphasizes that cultures are contested, narrated, and continuously reconstructed through public dialogue. This view is crucial for legal research because minority recognition should not freeze communities into static categories. A legal system that recognizes minorities only through rigid labels may protect identity at one level while limiting internal diversity at another. Minority groups are not uniform; they include differences of gender, class, generation, religiosity, language proficiency, migration history, and political orientation.

Legal pluralism deepens this analysis by showing that state law is not the only normative order shaping social life. Merry (1988) defines legal pluralism as the coexistence of multiple normative systems within the same social field. These may include state law, religious norms, customary practices, family expectations, professional rules, international standards, and informal community mechanisms. In globalized societies, legal pluralism becomes even more complex because transnational human-rights norms, diaspora networks, digital activism, international media, and cross-border legal consciousness influence local understandings of justice. Berman (2007) describes global legal pluralism as a condition in which multiple legal and quasi-legal regimes regulate the same actors and events. Minority rights are therefore shaped not only by national law but also by international conventions, regional norms, civil society networks, and the moral authority of global human-rights discourse.

International law has contributed significantly to the vocabulary of minority protection. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities affirms the rights of persons belonging to minorities to enjoy their culture, profess and practice their religion, use their language, participate in cultural, religious, social, economic, and public life, and participate effectively in decisions concerning them (United Nations, 1992).

Although the Declaration is not a binding treaty, it remains an important normative reference for minority-rights policy and legal interpretation. It also demonstrates that minority protection involves both non-discrimination and positive measures for identity preservation.

At the same time, the implementation of minority rights depends heavily on domestic constitutional structures, political culture, administrative practice, and judicial interpretation. In many societies, minority recognition is framed through constitutional equality clauses, language provisions, religious rights, anti-discrimination norms, education policy, and personal-status rules. The gap between formal recognition and lived recognition is often decisive. A minority group may be mentioned in law but remain underrepresented in public institutions. A regional language may be permitted in cultural expression but not fully supported in education or administration. Religious ceremonies may be legally tolerated but socially stigmatized. Such gaps make qualitative inquiry valuable because interviews can reveal how legal categories are experienced in ordinary life.

The Iranian context offers a meaningful site for examining these questions because Tehran is a socially diverse metropolitan space where ethnic, linguistic, religious, and cultural identities intersect with education, employment, media, migration, and state institutions. The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran recognizes equality regardless of ethnic group, race, color, and language in Article 19 and provides legal recognition for Zoroastrian, Jewish, and Christian Iranians as religious minorities in Article 13; Article 15 also permits the use of regional and tribal languages in press, media, and teaching of their literature in schools, in addition to Persian. These provisions show that minority recognition is present in the formal legal framework, while also raising questions about scope, implementation, public visibility, and the experiences of groups whose identities may not fit neatly into officially recognized categories.

Globalization adds another layer to this field. Minority communities increasingly compare local arrangements with international rights standards, diaspora experiences, global media representations, and legal developments in other jurisdictions. Digital communication enables minority actors to access rights language and mobilize symbolic resources beyond national borders. Yet globalization may also generate anxiety among states and majority populations, especially when minority claims are interpreted as threats to national unity, cultural cohesion, or political sovereignty. Therefore, legal recognition in globalized societies is not simply a movement toward more rights; it is a contested process of translation, adaptation, resistance, and negotiation.

Shachar's (2001) work on multicultural jurisdictions is particularly relevant here because it addresses the "paradox of multicultural vulnerability," in which group-based accommodation may unintentionally reinforce the power of traditional elites and disadvantage vulnerable members, especially women and younger people. This insight demonstrates that minority rights should not be reduced to group autonomy. A rights-based pluralism must protect cultural identity while ensuring that individuals within minority communities retain access to general citizenship rights and legal remedies. Phillips (2007) similarly criticizes approaches that treat culture as a fixed explanation for social practices, arguing that multiculturalism must avoid essentializing communities.

Despite extensive theoretical literature on multiculturalism, legal pluralism, and minority rights, there remains a need for qualitative studies that examine how people involved in minority-rights issues interpret legal recognition in specific social contexts. Legal recognition is not only a constitutional doctrine; it is also a lived experience shaped by bureaucratic encounters, public language, educational representation, media visibility, court procedures, and everyday perceptions of belonging. This study addresses that gap by exploring the perspectives of minority community members, legal professionals, civil society actors, and cultural stakeholders in Tehran. The central research question is: How do participants understand and experience the relationship between cultural pluralism, legal recognition, and minority rights in a globalized society?

Methods and Materials

This study used a qualitative research design to explore participants' lived and professional experiences of cultural pluralism, legal recognition, and minority rights. A qualitative approach was appropriate because the research aimed to understand meanings, interpretations, and social processes rather than measure predetermined variables. The study was conducted in Tehran, Iran, because Tehran is a diverse urban setting in which different ethnic, linguistic, religious, and cultural communities interact with state institutions, universities, courts, media, and civil society networks.

The study included 24 participants. Purposive sampling with maximum variation was used to recruit individuals who had direct lived experience or professional knowledge of minority-rights issues. Participants included 12 minority community members, 6 legal professionals, 4 civil society or cultural-rights actors, and 2 academic or policy stakeholders. Inclusion criteria were: being at least 18 years old, residing or working in Tehran, having lived experience or professional engagement with minority-rights issues, and willingness to participate in a semi-structured interview. Exclusion criteria included inability to provide informed consent or unwillingness to have the interview audio-recorded.

The sample size was determined by theoretical saturation. After the twentieth interview, no substantially new categories were emerging, but four additional interviews were conducted to confirm the stability of the categories and refine conceptual relationships. The final sample of 24 participants was considered adequate for the depth and scope of the study.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. The interview guide included open-ended questions about participants' understandings of cultural pluralism, experiences of legal recognition or non-recognition, access to institutions, language and religious rights, minority representation, discrimination, community norms, globalization, and the influence of international human-rights discourse. Examples of interview questions included: "What does legal recognition mean to you in relation to minority rights?" "Can you describe an experience in which cultural identity was either respected or ignored by an institution?" "How do global rights discourses influence local expectations?" and "What legal or institutional changes would improve minority inclusion?"

Interviews lasted between 45 and 80 minutes and were conducted in Persian. When participants used minority-language terms or culturally specific expressions, these were retained in transcripts with explanatory notes. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent and transcribed verbatim. Identifying details were removed during transcription, and participants were assigned codes from P01 to P24. Data collection continued until theoretical saturation was reached.

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis based on the six-phase approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006): familiarization with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report. NVivo software was used to manage transcripts, organize codes, compare coding patterns, write analytic memos, and retrieve quotations. The analysis was primarily inductive, although sensitizing concepts from multiculturalism, legal pluralism, and recognition theory informed interpretation.

First, transcripts were read repeatedly to develop familiarity with the data. Second, initial codes were generated for meaningful segments related to recognition, belonging, institutional barriers, cultural identity, legal protection, community norms, and globalization. Third, codes were grouped into preliminary categories. Fourth, categories were reviewed against the full dataset to ensure coherence and distinctiveness. Fifth, the final themes were named and defined. Finally, representative quotations were selected to illustrate each category.

Trustworthiness was enhanced through several strategies. Credibility was supported by prolonged engagement with the transcripts, peer review of selected codes, and participant validation of summary interpretations. Dependability was strengthened through an audit trail documenting coding decisions, category development, and theme refinement. Confirmability was supported through reflexive memo writing, in which the researcher recorded assumptions and interpretive decisions. Transferability was addressed by providing detailed descriptions of the research context, participants, and analytic procedures.

Ethical principles included informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymization, and the right to withdraw at any stage before data analysis.

Findings

A total of 24 participants took part in the study. Thirteen participants were women (54.2%) and eleven were men (45.8%). Participants ranged in age from 24 to 61 years. Seven participants were between 24 and 34 years old (29.2%), nine were between 35 and 44 years old (37.5%), five were between 45 and 54 years old (20.8%), and three were 55 years or older (12.5%). Regarding educational level, five participants held a bachelor's degree (20.8%), eleven held a master's degree (45.8%), six held a doctoral or professional law degree (25.0%), and two had diploma or associate-level education (8.3%). In terms of participant role, 12 were minority community members (50.0%), 6 were legal professionals (25.0%), 4 were civil society or cultural-rights actors (16.7%), and 2 were academic or policy stakeholders (8.3%). Participants' experiences covered ethnic, linguistic, religious, and cultural minority-rights issues; however, specific identity details were grouped to protect confidentiality.

The first category showed that participants understood legal recognition as both symbolic acknowledgment and practical administrative visibility. For many participants, recognition meant more than being mentioned in legal texts; it meant being visible in schools, courts, public offices, media, and official procedures. Participants described recognition as the ability to use cultural markers without fear of exclusion, to see minority histories reflected in education, and to interact with institutions without needing to hide or simplify identity. One participant stated, "Recognition is not only when the law says we exist. It is when the school, the office, and the court behave as if we exist" (P04, community member). Another participant explained, "Sometimes the law has a general language of equality, but the form you fill, the textbook you read, or the official ceremony you attend gives you the message that your identity is secondary" (P11, cultural-rights actor). Legal professionals also emphasized that administrative systems often translate abstract rights into everyday inclusion or exclusion. For example, one lawyer noted, "A right becomes real when there is a procedure for it. Without procedure, recognition stays in speeches" (P18, legal professional). This category suggests that participants viewed minority recognition as a continuum, moving from formal acknowledgment to institutional accommodation and everyday dignity.

The second category concerned conditional belonging. Participants reported that minorities may be formally included as citizens but still experience social or institutional expectations to minimize cultural difference in public spaces. They described belonging as conditional when acceptance depended on silence, assimilation, or avoiding claims-making. One participant said, "You are accepted when you do not ask for anything specific. The moment you ask for your language, your ceremony, or your representation, people say you are creating division" (P07, community member). Another participant stated, "The problem is not always open discrimination. Sometimes it is the feeling that equal citizenship means becoming invisible" (P02, community member). Several participants linked this experience to public narratives of national unity that valued diversity rhetorically but treated minority claims with suspicion. Civil society participants emphasized that cultural pluralism requires a shift from tolerance to participation. As one participant explained, "Tolerance means the majority allows you to remain different. Recognition means you participate in defining the common life" (P15, civil society actor). This category demonstrates that formal equality may be insufficient when minority identity is accepted only as a private matter and not as a legitimate dimension of public citizenship.

The third category reflected the complexity of legal pluralism. Participants described minority rights as shaped by overlapping normative systems, including state law, religious or customary norms, family expectations, community leadership, and global human-rights discourse. While many participants valued cultural autonomy, they also emphasized the need to protect individuals within minority communities from restrictive internal practices. One participant stated, "Community identity is

important, but no community should become a small court over the individual” (P20, academic stakeholder). A legal professional similarly observed, “Minority rights should protect the group from exclusion, but they should not leave women, youth, or dissenting members without remedies” (P19, legal professional). Some participants described generational differences, noting that younger members often sought both cultural continuity and individual choice. One participant explained, “My parents think preservation means keeping everything as it was. For my generation, preservation means having the freedom to choose what to keep” (P09, community member). This category indicates that participants rejected both forced assimilation and uncritical cultural autonomy. They favored a model of recognition that protects cultural identity while preserving individual rights, internal dialogue, and access to state legal remedies.

The fourth category showed that globalization has transformed how minority rights are imagined and articulated. Participants reported that international human-rights documents, diaspora networks, social media, comparative legal debates, and global education have expanded the vocabulary available for discussing recognition. One participant stated, “Before, people spoke about respect. Now they speak about rights, representation, and participation because they see these words everywhere” (P13, civil society actor). Another participant noted, “Globalization gives minorities confidence, but it can also make the majority defensive if rights language is seen as foreign pressure” (P22, policy stakeholder). Participants therefore described globalization as ambivalent: it empowers minority actors by connecting local claims to universal rights, but it may also provoke resistance when rights are framed as imported or politically threatening. Several participants emphasized that successful legal adaptation requires translating global norms into locally meaningful arguments. As one lawyer explained, “International standards are useful, but in court and policy you must connect them to domestic law, constitutional values, and social trust” (P17, legal professional). This category suggests that globalization does not simply replace local legal culture. Rather, it creates a field of negotiation in which minority-rights actors translate, reinterpret, and localize global principles.

Discussion

This qualitative study explored how participants in Tehran understood cultural pluralism, legal recognition, and minority rights in the context of globalization. The findings showed that legal recognition was experienced as a multilayered phenomenon: symbolic, administrative, participatory, and protective. Participants did not define recognition only as formal constitutional or statutory acknowledgment. Instead, they emphasized whether institutions behaved in ways that made minority identity visible, legitimate, and practically protected. This finding aligns with Taylor’s (1994) recognition theory, which argues that identity is partly shaped by public acknowledgment and that misrecognition can produce social harm. It also supports Kymlicka’s (1995) argument that minority rights can serve liberal-democratic goals when they protect the cultural contexts through which individuals exercise autonomy. In the present study, participants’ concern with forms, schools, courts, media, and public offices suggests that legal recognition must be institutionalized in everyday procedures. Recognition that remains abstract may have limited effect on lived equality.

The first major finding, legal recognition as symbolic and administrative visibility, is consistent with scholarship that treats minority rights as both normative and institutional. The United Nations Declaration on Minority Rights emphasizes not only non-discrimination but also minority participation and the protection of cultural, religious, ethnic, and linguistic identity (United Nations, 1992). Participants’ accounts reflected this dual structure. They valued general equality but considered it inadequate without practical mechanisms for visibility and participation. Fraser’s (2000) distinction between recognition and institutional status is useful here. For Fraser, injustice occurs when social arrangements prevent some groups from participating as peers in social life. The present findings confirm that recognition is not only about cultural respect; it is also about whether institutions provide equal standing. A minority identity becomes legally meaningful when administrative categories, educational narratives, media representation, and judicial procedures make space for it.

The second major finding concerned conditional belonging and unequal experiences of citizenship. Participants reported that minorities may be accepted when they remain culturally quiet but become problematized when they make specific claims. This finding corresponds with Parekh's (2000) critique of assimilationist citizenship, in which the majority culture presents itself as neutral while minority cultures are treated as particular or exceptional. It also aligns with Modood's (2013) argument that multicultural citizenship requires minorities to be included as co-authors of national identity rather than tolerated as private cultural communities. Participants' distinction between tolerance and recognition is especially important. Tolerance may preserve hierarchy because it implies that the majority permits minority difference. Recognition, by contrast, implies a more equal relationship in which minority groups participate in shaping the public sphere. This finding suggests that cultural pluralism becomes legally significant only when minorities are not required to privatize identity as the price of citizenship.

The third major finding highlighted the complexity of legal pluralism and the tension between group protection and individual rights. Participants recognized that minority communities are shaped by state law, religious norms, family expectations, customary practices, and global rights discourses. This is consistent with Merry's (1988) account of legal pluralism as the coexistence of multiple normative orders in the same social field. It also reflects Berman's (2007) argument that globalization intensifies legal pluralism by exposing individuals and communities to overlapping legal and quasi-legal regimes. However, participants did not romanticize community autonomy. They emphasized that minority recognition should not empower internal authorities to restrict vulnerable members. This finding strongly supports Shachar's (2001) concern with multicultural vulnerability, where accommodation of group difference may reinforce inequalities within the group. The participants' emphasis on women, youth, and dissenting members also aligns with Phillips's (2007) warning against treating culture as a fixed collective essence. Effective minority-rights policy must therefore avoid two opposite errors: assimilation into majority norms and uncritical delegation of authority to community elites.

The fourth major finding concerned globalization as a source of transnational rights language and local contestation. Participants described globalization as empowering because it provides minority actors with comparative examples, international standards, and vocabulary for claims-making. At the same time, they noted that global rights language may be resisted when it is perceived as foreign, politicized, or disconnected from domestic legal traditions. This finding aligns with Benhabib's (2002) view that cultural claims are produced through democratic iterations, in which universal norms are reinterpreted in local contexts. It also resonates with Santos's (2002) argument that law under globalization is not a single unified order but a field of competing scales, including local, national, and transnational legality. Participants' emphasis on translation is therefore significant. They did not reject international norms, but they argued that sustainable recognition requires local legitimacy, constitutional grounding, and institutional trust. Minority-rights discourse becomes more persuasive when global standards are connected to domestic values of equality, justice, dignity, and social coexistence.

Overall, the findings suggest that cultural pluralism in globalized societies requires a relational model of legal recognition. Recognition should not be reduced to symbolic inclusion, nor should it be limited to individual non-discrimination. Rather, it should include institutional responsiveness, participatory mechanisms, protection of cultural identity, and safeguards for vulnerable individuals. This conclusion is compatible with Kymlicka's (1995) liberal theory of minority rights, but it also extends it by emphasizing administrative practice and lived legal consciousness. Participants' narratives showed that minority rights are experienced at the intersection of law and everyday life. A constitutional guarantee may shape expectations, but the actual experience of equality depends on whether teachers, judges, administrators, employers, media institutions, and local authorities interpret diversity as a legitimate dimension of citizenship.

The study also contributes to legal pluralism scholarship by showing that minority-rights actors do not simply choose between state law and community norms. Instead, they move between legal and normative systems, strategically invoking

domestic law, religious or cultural values, international human-rights norms, and practical arguments about coexistence. This confirms Tamanaha's (2008) view that legal pluralism should be understood in historically and socially grounded ways rather than through a rigid definition of law. In the present study, participants' accounts showed that legal pluralism is not only a theoretical condition; it is a practical reality in which individuals must decide which authority to trust, which language to use, and which forum can provide recognition or remedy.

Another important implication is that minority-rights policy should distinguish between recognition as identity affirmation and recognition as institutional access. Participants valued cultural respect, but they repeatedly emphasized procedures, representation, complaint mechanisms, education, and administrative clarity. This indicates that minority rights cannot be implemented effectively through rhetorical multiculturalism alone. Legal systems require specific institutional pathways: anti-discrimination mechanisms, accessible legal aid, culturally competent public services, minority consultation, language-sensitive education, and transparent remedies. Without such mechanisms, cultural pluralism may remain a normative ideal without enforceable social consequences.

Finally, the study shows that globalization has changed minority legal consciousness. Participants were aware of international rights standards and comparative examples, but they also understood the political sensitivity of minority claims in national contexts. This finding suggests that globalized minority-rights discourse should be framed not as a challenge to social unity but as a means of deepening equal citizenship. Recognition can strengthen rather than weaken social cohesion when it enables minorities to experience the state as responsive, fair, and inclusive. The central challenge is to design legal institutions that recognize difference while maintaining shared citizenship and individual rights.

This study has several limitations. First, the study was conducted only in Tehran, and the findings may not fully represent experiences in other cities, rural regions, or border provinces where minority-rights issues may take different forms. Second, the sample size was appropriate for qualitative saturation but cannot support statistical generalization. Third, because minority rights can be politically and socially sensitive, some participants may have limited the details they were willing to share. Fourth, the study relied on interviews rather than observation, document analysis, or case-file review. Future studies could strengthen the evidence base by combining interviews with legal-document analysis, court observations, policy review, and comparative fieldwork.

Future research should examine minority-rights experiences across multiple cities and regions to compare how legal recognition is shaped by local demographics, institutional capacity, and historical relations among communities. Comparative studies between different national contexts would also help clarify how globalization affects minority-rights claims in societies with different constitutional traditions. Further research should explore specific domains such as education, language policy, religious practice, family law, media representation, employment discrimination, and access to justice. Studies focusing on women, youth, and internally diverse minority groups are especially important because group-based recognition may affect members differently. Longitudinal research could also examine how minority-rights discourse changes over time under the influence of digital activism, migration, and international legal developments.

Policymakers and legal institutions should move beyond general declarations of equality and develop clear procedures for implementing minority recognition in education, public administration, courts, media, and local governance. Public officials should receive training on cultural competence, anti-discrimination principles, and minority-rights standards. Minority communities should be included in consultation processes that affect cultural, linguistic, religious, and social rights. Legal aid and complaint mechanisms should be accessible to minority individuals, especially women, youth, and vulnerable members who may face both external discrimination and internal community pressure. Educational and media institutions should promote accurate representation of cultural diversity to normalize pluralism as part of shared citizenship.

Conclusion

This qualitative study demonstrated that cultural pluralism and legal recognition are deeply connected in the lived experience of minority rights. Participants understood recognition not only as formal legal acknowledgment but as institutional visibility, equal participation, cultural dignity, and access to remedies. The findings showed that formal equality may remain incomplete when minorities are expected to keep identity private or when legal systems lack practical procedures for accommodation. The study also revealed the importance of balancing group protection with individual rights, particularly in legally plural contexts where state law, community norms, and transnational rights discourses interact. Globalization expands the vocabulary of minority rights, but sustainable legal adaptation requires local legitimacy, institutional trust, and participatory implementation. Overall, the study concludes that minority rights in globalized societies require a model of recognition that is inclusive, procedural, dialogical, and protective of both cultural communities and individual members.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who helped us carrying out this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical principles were adhered in conducting and writing this article.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

- Benhabib, S. (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton University Press.
- Berman, P. S. (2007). Global legal pluralism. *Southern California Law Review*, 80, 1155–1238.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran. (1989). Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, as amended in 1989.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, 3, 107–120.

- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Merry, S. E. (1988). Legal pluralism. *Law & Society Review*, 22(5), 869–896.
- Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Macmillan.
- Phillips, A. (2007). *Multiculturalism without culture*. Princeton University Press.
- Santos, B. de S. (2002). *Toward a new legal common sense: Law, globalization, and emancipation* (2nd ed.). Butterworths LexisNexis.
- Shachar, A. (2001). *Multicultural jurisdictions: Cultural differences and women's rights*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tamanaha, B. Z. (2008). Understanding legal pluralism: Past to present, local to global. *Sydney Law Review*, 30(3), 375–411.
- Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton University Press.
- United Nations. (1992). *Declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities*. United Nations General Assembly Resolution 47/135.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton University Press.