Contesting Indonesian Plain vs Legal Languages: Analysis of Effectiveness on Indonesian Controversial Law

Marlia

Linguistics Studies Program, Postgraduate, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia;
Pasundan University, Bandung, Indonesia

Iwa Lukmana

Linguistics Studies Program, Postgraduate, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

Wawan Gunawan

Linguistics Studies Program, Postgraduate, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

Abstract—**This study is motivated by the difficulty of laypeople to understand the language of law. The study aims to analyze the high complexity of the Indonesian legal language and to generate alternatives that are more effective and easier for the general public. This study has tried to offer a simpler legal language formula, especially in the controversial articles of the Job Creation Law. The data in this study are in the form of text obtained through the official website of the State Secretariat, namely: https://jdih.setneg.go.id/Produk. This study uses a text analysis framework developed by Bivins (2008) as the framework used to apply plain language to legal language. This study shows that the application of plain language in controversial articles of the Job Creation Law is quite effective, especially in the components of sentences, cross-references, voice, and word choice.**

Index Terms—**plain language, legal language, controversial article, job creation law**

I. INTRODUCTION

Some studies reveal that it is difficult to understand legal language (Ahmad, 2017, pp. 153–154; Bivins, 2008, p. iii; Mukherjee et al., 2017, p. 2; Williams, 2015a, p. 184; Williams, 2004, p. 123). Williams emphasizes that legal language is linguistically unclear and most people do not understand it (Williams, 2004, p. 117). People often have to read a legal text more than once to understand the message. Things are more complicated if the text contains many foreign terms, long sentences, and other complexities affecting the reader's understanding (Mahadi & Sabaruddin, 1979). The fact shows that people's understanding of legal language is mostly at the minimum level. Whereas laws are made to regulate and organize human life within society to obtain certainty, benefit, and justice (Jalaluddin, 2011, p. 2). In addition, the law contains rules, conceptions, and actions based on the deliberation of law-making authorities. People must accept, understand, and obey the law (Mahadi & Sabaruddin, 1979, p. 31). In legal language, everything related to context should be stated clearly, covering all possibilities, ensuring nothing is left out to avoid ambiguity, misinterpretation, and misunderstanding (Dharmkar, 2018).

The public's discontent with legal language led to the birth of the Plain Language movement of the 1970s (Bivins, 2008, p. 4; Mukherjee et al., 2017, p. 1). It was a movement to make legal documents easier to understand by the general public. Some states, such as Australia, New Zealand, Scotland, and the United Kingdom currently advocate the use of plain language in the formulation of legislation. For example in the UK, the Tax Law Rewrite Project (TLRP) aims to rewrite tax laws in a simpler and more accessible format using modern language with shorter sentences (Mukherjee et al., 2017, p. 2). On March 24, 2005, Washington State Governor Christine Gregoire issued an executive order requiring all state agencies to follow simple language principles. These principles emphasize clear communication to the intended audience through the use of short sentences, logically organized information, and active forms (Bivins, 2008, pp. 6–7). The Plain Language movement has successfully changed the nature of legal documents in several countries and states, such as the United States-New York, Canada, Australia, the United States-Pennsylvania, New Zealand, South Africa, and Scotland (Williams, 2015, pp. 186–191). The fact shows that the use of plain language is effective in forming legal documents to be understood by the general public.

In the legal field, plain language has raised public awareness of the need to make legal issues and legal documents easier and accessible for non-experts (Williams, 2015, p. 183). Plain language is preferred by judges and other readers. They have tips on how to write in plain English and why you should. They have received complaints about poor legal writing (Wojcik, 2013, p. 6). According to the International Plain Language Federation (2021), plain language's

wording, structure, and design are so clear that the intended audience can easily find, understand, and apply the information.

Some of the efforts that have been made by the Plain Language movement include (1) shortening long sentences, (2) one sentence containing only a single idea, (3) placing subject and predicate close, (4) defining foreign terms, (5) no crossreferences, (6) use of words or phrases that express positive or affirmative forms, (7) use of active forms and first or the second person, (8) use of concrete verbs that show action (to reduce nominalization), (9) use of common words that are familiar to the audience and to avoid the use of unnecessary words (Bivins, 2008, pp. 84–85; Garner, 2013, pp. 21–60; Plain Language and Action Network, 2011, pp. 15–68; Sobota, 2014, pp. 23–26; Williams, 2004, pp. 117–123).

The efforts have succeeded to increase the reader's understanding of legal documents (Bivins, 2008, p. 129). Documents that use plain language techniques are effective in several ways: (1) better understanding for documents' readers, (2) preferred simple language, (3) faster information found, (4) easier document updated, (5) easier to be trained, and (6) more cost-effective documents (Baldwin, 1999). In addition, simple language embodies "good law" for society (Williams, 2015b, pp. 183–203).

Legal language studies have received a lot of attention. However, the main focus lies on its complexity and difficulty (Harkristuti, 2003; John, 2017; Hartini & Sudana, 2019; Mahadi & Sabaruddin, 1979; Susette, 2020). Only a few studies have mentioned plain language in the legal language (Bivins, 2008; Sobota, 2014; Williams, 2018; Williams, 2015).

For this reason, this study tried to examine the use of plain language in legal documents to improve the common people's understanding of legal products that in turn will be relevant to the efforts to improve the community's obedience to the law and order.

II. LITERATURE VIEW

A. Plain Language

Plain communication is defined by the International Plain Language Federation (2021) as "wording, structure, and design that are so clear that the intended audience can easily find the message, understand it, and use the information". A simple language makes communication easier, whether written or spoken (Wojcik, 2013, p. 3).

Plain language is more than a simplified language, or the elimination of legal language, jargon, and complex language. It is an approach to communication-based on audiences and the best method to convey an understandable message (Kinsella/Novak Communications Ltd, 2002, p. 1). Therefore, it can be concluded that plain language is a simple language aimed to facilitate a reader in understanding the content of a text so that the intended message can be conveyed effectively.

Plain Language movement seeks (1) to shorten long sentences, (2) to put one idea for one sentence, (3) to place subject and predicate close, (4) to define foreign terms, (5) not to contain cross-references, (6) to use words or phrases that express positive or affirmative forms, (7) to use active forms and first or second person, (8) to use concrete verbs that show action (to reduce nominalization), (9) to use common words that are familiar to the audience and to avoid the use of unnecessary words (Bivins, 2008, pp. 84–85; Garner, 2013, pp. 21–60; Plain Language and Action Network, 2011, pp. 15–68; Sobota, 2014, pp. 23–26; Williams, 2004, pp. 117–123).

The plain language movement has changed legal professions. Most law schools currently teach a simple style of writing law. Court rules, such as the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, have been rewritten to make it easier for lawyers and judges (Wydick & Sloan, 2019, p. 14).

B. Legal Language

Legal language is the language used to formulate and state law in a particular society (Mahadi & Sabaruddin, 1979, p. 50). However, legal language, as the language of legislation, aims to create order and justice to maintain public and private interests within society (Hadikusuma, 1992, p. 3). However, legal language is considered part of the modern Indonesian language. Therefore, its use must be clear, monosemantic, and meet the aesthetic requirements of the Indonesian language. Legal language is the language of laws and regulations that is used to maintain order and justice in society, as well as to defend public and personal interests (Bachari, 2020, p. 28).

Legal language is full of literal meanings and precise boundaries. It is expected that confusion can be eliminated and legal certainty can be obtained. The contents of the legal language in rules include rights and obligations to be obeyed and implemented by the whole community in the realm of law. Legal language is created following the development of current legal issues (Hartini, 2019b, pp. 18–19). The Indonesian legal language is Indonesian which is used in the field of law and does not leave the Indonesian language rules and requirements (Purnanto, 2006, p. 57). It can be concluded that the legal language is the language used in law to regulate the public interest within the society, nation, and state.

Every use of language, both spoken and written, by legal experts and practitioners, can be called legal language (Purnanto, 2006, p. 57). Based on the principle that Indonesian in the legal field is the most abstract, logical, clear, and comprehensive part of the national language, the language variety must also comply with the structure, spelling, and grammar of the Indonesian language rules. In other words, every linguistic provision that the standard language must

comply with in general must also be applied in legal or legislation language and used by legal experts (both theorists and practitioners).

The characteristics of scientific language, including legal language, among others, are (1) broad and exact to avoid ambiguity; (2) objective and suppresses personal prejudice; (3) to provide definitions of names, properties, and categories that are carefully investigated to avoid confusion; (4) unemotional and avoid sensational judgments; (5) tend to standardize the meaning of words, expressions, and also their presentation based on conventions; (6) scientific, not dogmatic or fanatical; (7) thrifty scientific style; (8) a more stable form, meaning, and function of scientific words than ordinary words (Moeliono in Saleh, 1988, p. 18).

The characteristics of legal language also include (1) the use of long sentences and complex grammatical structures, (2) passive and double negative sentences, (3) the use of French and Latin, and (4) ancient stylistics (Rahayuningsih, 2003, pp. 10–15). In other perspectives, the characteristics include clarity of meaning, unity of thought, directness, and formality (Ahmad, 2017, p. 147). As a result, the characteristics of legal language are distinct. Unfortunately, in reality, most people do not understand the meaning of the language contained in law due to the complexity of using the language.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study used a text analysis framework developed by Bivins (2008) and applied it to the plain language of a legal text. The data is the text of the Job Creation Law, also known as Omnibus Law, signed into law by President Joko Widodo on Monday, November 2, 2020. The law, which consists of 15 chapters and 186 articles, governs a wide range of issues, from employment to the environment. This study focused on the articles that are considered problematic and controversial in Chapter IV on Manpower. There are four articles selected as the sample of the research. They are Article 59 on contract workers; Article 77 on working hours; Article 78 on overtime provisions; and Article 79 on leave and rest rights because these articles are known as the controversial articles (Tempo. co, 2020b). The data were downloaded from a trusted page, https://jdih.setneg.go.id/Produk. After the data was downloaded, I identified controversial articles in the law. After that, the data is transcribed in word form by sorting it by clause. Then, the clauses are presented in a table containing the original text and the revised text. This is done to contrast before and after the application of plain language in these articles. This table was adopted from Bivins (2008). The following table compares the original article with the revised article.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON BEFORE AND AFTER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAIN LANGUAGE

Original Text	Revised Text

The instrument used for the application of plain language in this legal language is the text evaluation rubric adopted from Bivins (2008, p. 84) as follows.

TABLE 2
TEXT EVALUATION RUBRIC
(Bivins, 2008, p. 84)

Element	Poor	Effective
Sentences	Long sentences can be found in the document.	Short sentences are used in the document.
	The sentences in the document have an unusually high number of subordinate clauses and/or conjoined clauses.	Each sentence expresses a single thought.
	In the sentence, large sections of text separate the subject and verb.	The subject and verb are close together in the sentence.
Cross-references and definitions	The document refers to definitions in another section.	In the context of the text, the document defines an unfamiliar term.
	The document refers to a different section or document.	There are no cross-references in the document.
Negatives	The document contains negative words or phrases and/or a series of negatives.	The document employs words or phrases that convey a positive or affirmative message.
Voice	The passive voice and third-person voice are preferred in the document.	The document employs active voice and either first- or second-person pronouns.
Nominalizations	The document includes verbs that have been transformed into nouns by the addition of suffixes such as "tion."	The document employs action-oriented concrete verbs.
Word choices	The document employs: • Archaic words and expressions like "to wit" and "said." • Words like "here in" and "there in" are used here and there. • Doublets and triplets, such as "indemnify and hold harmless," are common. • Formal phrases like "this honorable court" • Legalisms and lawyerisms like "pursuant to" and "subsequent to"	The document avoids using unnecessary words and uses common words that the audience is familiar with.

On the rubric, Bivins focuses on analyzing the elements of sentence length, subordinate clauses and compound clauses, subject-verb positions, cross-references and definitions, negative-positive forms in sentences, the passive-active voice in sentences, use of the third person voice, and poor or unnecessary diction (Bivins, 2008, p. 74).

Thus, the data were analyzed through some stages. First, the sentence of the controversial article on the Job Creation Law was revised based on the rubric for evaluating the Bivins text. Second, the original article and the revised article were compared and analyzed. Third, the original article and the revised article were categorized based on the rubric, whether it is classified as bad or effective. Fourth, the effectiveness of the application of plain language was concluded.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study analyzed the application of plain language to controversial articles of the Job Creation Law. They are Article 59 on contract workers; Article 77 on working hours; Article 78 on overtime provisions; and Article 79 on leave and rest rights. These articles must undoubtedly be understood by employers and workers/laborers. However, in reality, there are still many people who do not understand the contents of these articles (CNN Indonesia, 2020; Tempo. co, 2020a). Whereas readability has risen to prominence as a factor influencing the quality of a piece of writing or text. Texts that cannot express what their authors are thinking can lead to misunderstandings on the part of their readers. (Abdollahzadeh & Zolfaghari-Erdechi, 2012, p. 45). In addition, according to Novak and Gowin (1984) the reader is expected to derive meaning from the written text in addition to having oral proficiency, looking at graphic symbols from left to right, and decoding the printed symbols on a page (Alibabaee et al., 2014, p. 3). It is for this reason that simplification of legal language is necessary to avoid misperceptions that harm many parties.

The use of simple language in legal documents has made the legal language easier to understand (Williams, 2015, p. 183; Bivins, 2008, p. 129; Baldwin, 1999). The same surely goes for the controversial articles of the Job Creation Law. This section describes how the article was changed to be simpler. The Bivins text evaluation rubric is used to implement the plain language. The first attempt is to improve the sentence elements.

Example: Article 59 paragraph 1

(1) "*Perjanjian kerja untuk waktu tertentu hanya dapat dibuat untuk pekerjaan tertentu yang menurut jenis dan sifat atau kegiatan pekerjaannya akan selesai dalam waktu tertentu, yaitu:*
  a. *pekerjaan yang sekali selesai atau yang sementara sifatnya;*
  b. *pekerjaaan yang diperkirakan penyelesaiannya dalam waktu yang tidak terlalu lama;*
  c. *pekerjaan yang bersifat musiman;*
  d. *pekerjaan yang berhubungan dengan produk baru, kegiatan baru, atau produk tambahan yang masih dalam percobaan atau penjajakan; atau*
  e. *pekerjaan yang jenis dan sifat atau kegiatannya bersifat tidak tetap.*"

(1) "A work agreement for a certain time can only be made for certain jobs which according to the type and nature or activities of the work will be completed within a certain time, namely:
  a. work that is once completed or temporary in nature;
  b. work which is estimated to be completed in a not too long time;
  c. seasonal work;
  d. work related to new products, new activities, or additional products that are still under trial or exploration; or
  e. work whose type and nature or activities are not permanent."

Article 59 paragraph 1 has 7 clauses: (1) "*perjanjian kerja untuk waktu tertentu hanya dapat dibuat untuk pekerjaan tertentu*; (2) *pekerjaan tertentu yang menurut jenis dan sifat atau kegiatan pekerjaannya akan selesai dalam waktu tertentu*; (3) *pekerjaan yang sekali selesai atau yang sementara sifatnya*; (4) *pekerjaaan yang diperkirakan penyelesaiannya dalam waktu yang tidak terlalu lama*; (5) *pekerjaan yang bersifat musiman*; (6) *pekerjaan yang berhubungan dengan produk baru, kegiatan baru, atau produk tambahan yang masih dalam percobaan atau penjajakan*; and (7) *pekerjaan yang jenis dan sifat atau kegiatannya bersifat tidak tetap.*" This article uses long sentences. Even though, these 7 clauses can be changed to 1 clause. Table 3 describes the changes before and after the implementation of the plain language.

TABLE 3
COMPARISON BEFORE AND AFTER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAIN LANGUAGE

Original Text	Revised Text
(1) "*Perjanjian kerja untuk waktu tertentu hanya dapat dibuat untuk pekerjaan tertentu yang menurut jenis dan sifat atau kegiatan pekerjaannya akan selesai dalam waktu tertentu, yaitu:* a. *pekerjaan yang sekali selesai atau yang sementara sifatnya;* b. *pekerjaaan yang diperkirakan penyelesaiannya dalam waktu yang tidak terlalu lama;* c. *pekerjaan yang bersifat musiman;* d. *pekerjaan yang berhubungan dengan produk baru, kegiatan baru, atau produk tambahan yang masih dalam percobaan atau penjajakan; atau* e. *pekerjaan yang jenis dan sifat atau kegiatannya bersifat tidak tetap.*"	(1) *Setiap pengusaha hanya membuat perjanjian kerja waktu tertentu untuk pekerjaan sekali selesai, sementara, tidak terlalu lama, musiman, produk dalam masa percobaan, dan tidak tetap.* (1) Every entrepreneur only makes a work agreement for a certain period for the work to be completed once, temporarily, not too long, seasonal, product in a trial period, and not permanent.

The example in table 3 shows that sometimes small changes to the wording of a document can affect its understanding (Bivins, 2008, p. 92). The revised text is to make the subject explicit, by adding "every entrepreneur" at the beginning of the sentence; changing the passive to active by changing the verb "*dibuat*" (be made) to "*membuat*" (make); combine the subordinate clause with the main clause; remove words that are not needed, such as "*dapat*" (can), "*yang*" (which), "*akan*" (will) and repeated phrases "*tertentu*" (certain), "*jenis dan sifat*" (type and nature), and "*kegiatan pekerjaan*" (work activities).

It is also correlated with the complexity of a text. The complexity of the sentence can be seen through the number of complex sentences in discourse, both written and oral. The more complex a sentence, the more complex the discourse or the more complicated the discourse. The complexity of the sentence can be seen also based on the number of clauses and the number of words. Sentence complexity based on the number of clauses is the number of clauses in a sentence that determines whether the sentence is a simple sentence or a complex sentence. On the other hand, the complexity of a sentence based on the number of words is the number of words in a sentence that determines whether the sentence is a simple sentence or a complex sentence (Suraningati & Mulyono, 2020, p. 2).

Likewise, the sentences contained in the controversial articles of the Job Creation Law have many sentences contained. This can be seen from the number of clauses. The following summarizes the comparison of the number of clauses before and after plain language is applied.

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF CLAUSES BEFORE AND AFTER REVISION

Article	Number of Clauses Before Revision	Number of Clauses
59	10	4
77	6	4
78	6	4
79	9	7

Table 4 shows that the application of plain language has succeeded in reducing sentence length. According to the Bivins text evaluation rubric (Bivins, 2008, p. 84), a text is "poor" if it contains a long sentence, contains too many subordinate clauses and/or compound clauses, and most of the text separates the subject and verb in the sentence. The text is said to be "effective" if it contains short sentences, each sentence expresses only one idea, and the subject and verb are placed close together.

The second attempt focuses on improving cross-reference elements and definitions.
Example: Article 77 paragraphs 1 and 2
(1)   "Setiap Pengusaha wajib melaksanakan ketentuan waktu kerja."
(2)   "Waktu kerja sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) meliputi:
*   a.   7 (tujuh) jam 1 (satu) hari dan 40 (empat puluh) jam 1 (satu) minggu untuk 6 (enam) hari kerja dalam 1 (satu) minggu; atau*
*   b.   8 (delapan) jam 1 (satu) hari dan 40 (empat puluh) jam 1 (satu) minggu untuk 5 (lima) hari kerja dalam 1 (satu) minggu."*
(1) "Every entrepreneur is obliged to implement the provisions on working time."
(2) "The working time as referred to in paragraph (1) includes:
   a.   7 (seven) hours 1 (one) day and 40 (forty) hours 1 (one) week for 6 (six) working days in 1 (one) week; or
   b.   8 (eight) hours 1 (one) day and 40 (forty) hours 1 (one) week for 5 (five) working days in 1 (one) week."

Article 77 paragraphs 1 and 2 indicate that there is a cross-reference, namely the phrase "*waktu kerja*" (working time), which in paragraph 1 refers to another part in paragraph 2. The reference to "*waktu kerja*" (working time) can be combined into one part so that no cross-reference is needed. Table 5 illustrates the refinement of cross-reference elements and definitions.

TABLE 5
REVISION OF CROSS-REFERENCE ELEMENTS AND DEFINITIONS

Original Text	Revised Text
(1) "Setiap Pengusaha wajib melaksanakan ketentuan waktu kerja." *(2) "Waktu kerja sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) meliputi:* * a. 7 (tujuh) jam 1 (satu) hari dan 40 (empat puluh) jam 1 (satu) minggu untuk 6 (enam) hari kerja dalam 1 (satu) minggu; atau* * b. 8 (delapan) jam 1 (satu) hari dan 40 (empat puluh) jam 1 (satu) minggu untuk 5 (lima) hari kerja dalam 1 (satu) minggu."*	*(1) Setiap pengusaha wajib melaksanakan ketentuan waktu kerja yang meliputi 7 jam per hari, 40 jam per 6 hari atau 8 jam per hari, 40 jam per 5 hari.* (1) Every entrepreneur is obliged to implement the provisions on working time which include 7 hours per day, 40 hours per 6 days or 8 hours per day, 40 hours per 5 days.

The revised text is to remove the "*waktu kerja*" (work time) cross-reference contained in paragraph 1 so that it does not refer to other parts (paragraph 2). Table 5 shows that the original text is categorized poorly because it uses cross-references that refer to other parts. The revised text is categorized effectively because it eliminates cross-references (Bivins, 2008, p. 84).

Cross-references can make readers stop and find cross-references that will distract readers and disrupt their reading patterns. This is why text that contains cross-references is categorized poorly. It is different if there are no cross-references. Readers will not stop and can find information in the same location (not separated in other parts), and this is considered more effective (Bivins, 2008, pp. 79–80).

The third attempt is a negative element. Based on the identification, the author does not find many negative expressions in the controversial articles of the Job Creation Law. Using the negative form that appears is not as bad as Bivins intended, but it is still effective.

Example: Article 78 paragraph 3

(3)   "*Ketentuan waktu kerja lembur sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) huruf b tidak berlaku bagi sektor usaha atau pekerjaan tertentu.*"

(3) Provisions for overtime work as referred to in paragraph (1) letter b does not apply to certain business sectors or occupations

Article 78 paragraph 3 uses the negative form "*tidak*" (not). The use of the word "*tidak*" (not) in this article clarifies the statement of the paragraph that the provisions for overtime work are not applied to certain fields of business/work. This does not make the text bad. Thus, even though there is the word "*tidak*" (not), it is still considered effective.

The fourth effort is the voice element.

Example: Article 78 paragraph 4

(4) *Ketentuan lebih lanjut mengenai waktu kerja lembur dan upah kerja lembur diatur dalam Peraturan Pemerintah.*

(4) Further provisions regarding overtime work and pay are regulated in a Government Regulation.

Article 78 paragraph 4 uses the passive voice, seen in the use of the verb "*diatur*" (regulated). According to Bivins (2008, p. 84), documents with passive voice are poor documents; and documents with active voice are effective documents. Table 6 illustrates the correction of passive to active sentences.

TABLE 6
REVISED VOICE-PASSIVE ELEMENTS TO ACTIVE

Original Text	Revised Text
(4) Ketentuan lebih lanjut mengenai waktu kerja lembur dan upah kerja lembur diatur dalam Peraturan Pemerintah.	*(4) Peraturan pemerintah mengatur ketentuan lebih lanjut mengenai waktu kerja lembur dan upah kerja lembur.*
	(4) Further provisions regarding overtime work and pay are regulated in a Government Regulation.

Points of improvement include (1) the changing of the passive verb "*diatur*" (regulated) to the active verb "*mengatur*" (regulate); (2) shifting the position of the phrase "*peraturan pemerintah*" (government regulation), which was originally in a complementary position to being the subject; and (3) shifting the position of the sentence "*ketentuan lebih lanjut mengenai waktu kerja lembur dan upah kerja lembur*" (further provisions regarding overtime work and pay), which was originally in the position of the subject becomes in the position of the object.

Passive sentences usually omit actors in the sentence. This tends to make sentences difficult for the readers to determine who and what action to take. The use of passive voice is allowed for some reasons but documents that use too much passive voice tend to be rated poorly. On the other hand, documents that use active sentences are rated better because they use concrete verbs so that the actor appears in the sentence. It allows the reader to immediately know who did the action (Bivins, 2008, pp. 80–81). To make it easier for readers to understand a passage, it is better to change the passive sentences to active sentences.

The fifth effort is the element of nominalization. The primary function of nominalization in modern scientific practice is thus to provide an efficient and easily referable description of complex physical processes (Jalilifar et al., 2014, p. 36). Based on the identification, controversial articles of the Job Creation Law have used action verbs in their predicates like the verbs "*memberi*" (give), "*meliputi*" (cover), "*diatur*" (regulated), "*dibuat*" (made), "*diadakan*" (held), and "*berlaku*" (applies). The emergence of nominalizations such as "*perjanjian*" (agreements), "*ketentuan*" (provisions), "*peraturan*" (regulations) are nominalizations contained in the subject or object. They are not contained in the predicate, and no correction is needed. Therefore, it can be said that the nominalization element is considered effective.

The sixth attempt is the word choice element.

Example: Article 79 paragraph 4

(4)   "*Pelaksanaan cuti tahunan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (3) diatur dalam perjanjian kerja, peraturan perusahaan, atau perjanjian kerja bersama.*"

(4) "The implementation of annual leave as referred to in paragraph (3) is regulated in a work agreement, company regulations, or collective work agreement."

Article 79 paragraph 4 contains words that are legalism and lawyerisms as well as unnecessary words, namely "…sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat …" ("...as referred to in paragraph ..."). It indicates that this article has poor word choice (Bivins, 2008, p. 84). Table 7 describes improvements to the word choice elements.

TABLE 7
REVISION OF WORD CHOICES ELEMENTS

Original Text	Revised Text
(4) *Pelaksanaan cuti tahunan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (3) diatur dalam perjanjian kerja, peraturan perusahaan, atau perjanjian kerja bersama.*	(4) *Perjanjian kerja, peraturan perusahaan, atau perjanjian kerja bersama mengatur pelaksanaan cuti tahunan.*
	(4) Work agreements, company regulations, or collective work agreements regulate the implementation of annual leave.

The corrected text removes words that are legalism and lawyerisms and eliminates unnecessary words in article 79 paragraph 4, namely eliminating phrases "…*sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat…*" ("...as referred to in paragraph ..."). The omission of the phrase does not cause confusion of meaning/intention because the main point of this article is the regulation regarding the implementation of annual leave, not paragraph references, so eliminating unnecessary phrases/words is considered more effective (Bivins, 2008, p. 84; Williams, 2004, p. 120).

This analysis shows that legal documents tend to use long and complex sentences and rarely use short sentences. The majority use of passive sentences, as if repeated, and words that are not needed can confuse readers and writers (Sobota, 2014, pp. 23–25). Therefore, the application of plain language is very necessary. Plain language can be applied to various documents that have a language component and focus on communication purposes (Balmford in Bivins, 2008, p. 7). The application of plain language to legal documents can clarify the intent and the reader does not need to read it over and over again or wonder about the author's intention. In addition, readers can quickly find the information they need (Bivins, 2008, pp. 7–8).

This study indicates that legal practitioners must realize the importance of linguists' contribution in the preparation of legal documents because linguists' involvement can contribute principles and rules of the Indonesian language to avoid imperfections of the Indonesian legal language. Both spoken and writing legal opinions can be resolved (Bachari, 2020, p. 31). Law Number 12 of 2011 Chapter III on the Variety of Languages of Legislative Regulations Article 242 confirms that the language of laws and regulations is governed by Indonesian grammar rules, which govern word formation, structure, writing techniques, and spelling. However, legal language and regulations have a style that is distinguished by clarity of understanding, directness, standardization, harmony, and adherence to legal requirements principles, both in formulation and writing methods. Thus, linguists can be involved in the preparation of legal documents.

In addition, legal practitioners have a tendency to maintain the uniqueness of the legal language without considering the community's understanding because laws are made to regulate and organize life in a state so that the people governed by the law obtain certainty, benefit, and justice in life (Jalaluddin, 2011, p. 2). If the legal language confuses the public, of course, the community will be harmed even though they are the ones who are bound and burdened with the obligation to comply with the legal documents produced (Murniah in Ahmad, 2017, p. 154). Thus, the legal language must be made easy. All people must understand the rules. It is not intended exclusively for people who study it (Kurniawan in Hartini, 2019a, p. 70).

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, it is possible to conclude that the contentious articles of the Job Creation Law contain two effective elements: negative and nominalization. The other four elements (sentences, cross-references, voice, and word choice) are still in the poor category. Overall, these articles still use long sentences, have many subordinate clauses, contain cross-references, tend to use the passive voice, and bring up the words legalisms and lawyerisms and unnecessary words. The application of plain language to the four elements shows significant effectiveness. Therefore, the use of plain language should appropriately be promoted in the Indonesian legal language.

In addition, the application of plain language does not escape the use of linguistics, such as the use of sentences, choice of words, use of spelling, etc. It indicates that it is necessary to involve linguists in the preparation of legal documents to achieve effectiveness for the sake of overall law enforcement.

This study still needs to be developed further, especially regarding the validation of legal experts and readers' understanding before and after the text is corrected. For further studies, there are some suggestions. First, expert judgment is needed, especially from legal drafters to ensure that the text corrections made do not go out of context/meaning. Second, readers, especially entrepreneurs and workers, should respond to find out the understanding of the text before and after it has been revised.

REFERENCES

[1] Abdollahzadeh, E., & Zolfaghari-Erdechi, F. (2012). Exploring the Relationship Between Modality and Readability Across Different Text Types. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, *3*(1), 44–61.
[2] Ahmad, N. A. (2017). Problematika Penggunaan Bahasa Hukum Indonesia. *Al-Himayah*, *1*(1), 145–157.
[3] Alibabaee, A., Mehranfar, Z., Golam, &, & Zarei, R. (2014). Role of Teacher-Constructed vs. Cooperative Concept Map Learning Strategies in EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension and Autonomy. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, *5*(1), 3–23.
[4] Bachari, A. D. (2020). *Linguistik Forensik: Telaah Holistik Bahasa dalam Konteks Hukum*. Prodi Linguistik SPS UPI.

[5]   Bivins, P. (2008). Implementing Plain Language Into Legal Documents: the Technical Communicator'S Role. *STARS*, *2008*, 194. Retrieved May 24, 2022, from http://etd.fcla.edu/CF/CFE0002022/Bivins_Peggy_G_200805_MA.pdf.

[6]   CNN Indonesia. (2020). *Tak Paham Omnibus Law, Warga Cuma Tahu Kerja Makin Susah*. Retrieved May 24, 2022, from https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20201007100005-20-555313/tak-paham-omnibus-law-warga-cuma-tahu-kerja-makin-susah.

[7]   Dharmkar, R. (2018). Why is legal language so complicated, and filled with complex words difficult to understand by a common man? Why can't simple language be used? *Quora*. Retrieved May 24, 2022, from https://www.quora.com/Why-is-legal-language-so-complicated-and-filled-with-complex-words-difficult-to-understand-by-a-common-man-Why-cant-simple-language-be-used.

[8]   Garner, B. A. (2013). Legal Writing in Plain English: A Text with Exercises. In *Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 6*(11)*, 951–952.* (Second Edi). The University of Chicago Press.

[9]   Harkristuti, H. (2003). Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Sarana Pengembangan Hukum Nasional. *Kongres Bahasa Indonesia VIII.*

[10] Hartini, L. (2019a). *Bahasa dan Produk Hukum*. Refika Aditama.

[11] Hartini, L. (2019b). Problematika Penerapan Tanda Baca dan Pola Kalimat dalam Produk Peraturan Daerah. *Deskripsi Bahasa*, *2*(2), 165–173.

[12] Hilman Hadikusuma. (1992). *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Adat Indonesia*. Mandar Maju.

[13] Ismail Saleh. (1988). *Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Sarana untuk Menciptakan Tertib Hukum Masyarakat*. Kongres Bahasa Indonesia V.

[14] Jalaluddin. (2011). Hakikat Dan Fungsi Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Sebagai Batu Uji Kritis Terhadap Gagasan Pembentukan Perda Yang Baik. *Aktualita*, *6*(3), 1–19.

[15] Jalilifar, A., Alipour, M., & Parsa, S. (2014). Comparative study of nominalization in applied linguistics and biology books. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, *5*(1), 24–43.

[16] John, A. (2017). Why is Legal Language So Complicated? *Pathlegal*. Retrieved May 27, 2022, from https://www.pathlegal.in/Why-is-legal-language-so-complicated--blog-1048999.

[17] Kinsella/Novak Communications Ltd. (2002). The Plain Language Primer for Class Action Notice. In *The Art and Science of Legal Notification*.

[18] Lilis Hartini; Dadang Sudana. (2019). Problematika Penerapan Tanda Baca dan Pola Kalimat dalam Produk Peraturan Daerah. *Deskripsi Bahasa*, *2*(2), 165–173.

[19] Mahadi, & Sabaruddin, A. (1979). *Penggunaan Bahasa Hukum Indonesia*. Bina Cipta.

[20] Mukherjee, N., Narayanan, S., Chandrashekaran, S., Sengupta, A., Sharma, R., & Srinivasan, S. (2017). M Anual O Perativo. *Vidhi*, *March.*

[21] Plain Language and Action Network. (2011). Federal Plain Language Guidelines. *Federal Plain Language Guidelines*, *1*(March).

[22] Purnanto, D. (2006). Karakteristik dan Penafsiran Pemakaian Bahasa Bidang Hukum. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, *18*(34), 56–66. Retrieved May 27, 2022, from http://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/KLS/article/view/5136.

[23] Rahayuningsih, H. (2003). *Penerjemahan Teks Hukum dan Permasalahannya. Dalam Kongres Nasional Penerjemahan.* Fakultas Sastra dan Seni Rupa UNS.

[24] Sobota, A. (2014). The Plain Language Movement and Modern Legal Drafting. *Comparative Legilinguistics*, *20*(2), 19–30.

[25] Suraningati, D. S., & Mulyono. (2020). *Kompleksitas Kalimat Bahasa Indonesia dalam Tuturan Guru TK Tarbiyatul Atfhal*.

[26] Susette, H. (2020). Simplifying Legal Writing. *Writer Access*. Retrieved June 06, 2022, from https://www.writeraccess.com/blog/simplifying-legal-writing/.

[27] Tempo.co. (2020a). *Cerita Perusuh Demonstrasi Omnibus Law yang Ngaku Tah Tahu Isi UU Cipta Kerja*. Retrieved May 24, 2022, from https://metro.tempo.co/read/1394860/cerita-perusuh-demonstrasi-omnibus-law-yang-ngaku-tak-tahu-isi-uu-cipta-kerja.

[28] Tempo.co. (2020b). Nasib Empat Pasal Kontroversial dalam UU Cipta Kerja. *Tempo.Co*. Retrieved May 24, 2022, from https://nasional.tempo.co/read/1393292/nasib-empat-pasal-kontroversial-dalam-uu-cipta-kerja.

[29] Williams, C. (2015a). *Changing with the times: the evolution of Plain Language in the Legal Sphere*. rua.ua.es. Retrieved June 06, 2022, from http://rua.ua.es/dspace/handle/10045/54185.

[30] Williams, C. (2015b). Further reflections on popularization and plain language in legal discourse: some recent developments. In *Variations in Specialized Genres: Standardization and Popularization*, 81-94

[31] Williams, C. (2018). *The impact of plain language on legal English in the United Kingdom*. London: Routledge.

[32] Williams, Christopher. (2004). Legal English and Plain Language: an update. *{ESP} Across Cultures*, *1*, 111–124.

[33] Williams, Christopher. (2015). Changing with the Times: The Evolution of Plain Language in the Legal Sphere. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, *28*(28), 183. https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2015.28.10

[34] Wojcik, M. E. (2013). Plain language for lawyers. *Federation Press*, 3–7.

[35] Wydick, R. C., & Sloan, A. E. (2019). *Plain English for Lawyers* (6th ed.). Carolina Academic Press, LLC.

Marlia graduated from the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia, 2005 (Bachelor in Indonesian Education); Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia, 2008 (Master in Linguistics). Currently, she is pursuing a degree of doctorate at the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia. Her research interests include Critical Discourse Analysis, Psycholinguistics, and Pragmatics. In addition, she is a lecturer at Indonesian Education, Pasundan University, Bandung, Indonesia.

Iwa Lukmana graduated from the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia, 1992 (Bachelor in English Education); Deakin University, Geelong, Australia, 1992 (Master in TESOL); Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, 2006 (Ph.D. in Linguistics). His research interests include Critical Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics, and Systemic Functional Linguistics. In addition, he is a lecturer at the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia.

Wawan Gunawan graduated from the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia, 1997 (Bachelor in English Education); University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, 2002 (Master in Literacy Education); University of Massachusetts, Boston, Amerika, 2014 (Ph.D. in Literacy Education). His research interests include English Grammar and Systemic Functional Linguistics. In addition, he is a lecturer at the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia.