Implications of the Job Creation Law for the Protection of Labor Rights in Indonesia

Yeti Kurniati
kurniati15yeti@gmail.com

Program Studi Ilmu Hukum, Universitas Langlang Buana, Bandung

Article Info
Received: 2021-01-02
Revised: 2021-05-21
Accepted: 2021-06-30

Keywords:
Job Creation Law, Protection, Labor Rights

Abstract
The Job Creation Law is one of the structural reform policies that have been implemented by the Indonesian government with the aim of improving the investment climate and expanding employment opportunities. Despite its positive aims, the law has also generated debate and controversy regarding the resulting implications for labor rights. This study aims to analyze the impact that the Job Creation Law has had on the protection of labor rights in Indonesia. This research uses a normative juridical method with a statutory approach. In addition, this research also includes monitoring changes in policies, company practices, and workers' attitudes towards the implementation of the Job Creation Law. The results of the research show that the work copyright law has been rejected by various community clusters with the view that it does not provide adequate benefits and protection for Indonesian workers or laborers. Some of the implications of this law for the protection of workers' rights in Indonesia based on Article 81 chapter IV of the Job Copyright Law which discusses employment are the abolition of several provisions regarding severance pay, ease of entry of foreign workers, abolition of the maximum limit for contract workers, and abolition of the system City/District Minimum Wage.

1. INTRODUCTION

Ensuring employment plays a vital role in Indonesia's national development, aligned with the principles of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Consequently, there is a crucial need for well-defined regulations in the country to safeguard workers' rights and enhance their protection. Advancing labor protection is a paramount objective, as it directly contributes to elevating the dignity and well-being of the workforce (Sinaga & Zaluchu, 2021).

Labor protection is designed to ensure that workers' fundamental rights are upheld, taking into account the evolving complexities in the national and global business landscape (Latupono, 2011). Among the rights sought for workers is the entitlement to fair compensation and appropriate treatment within the employer-employee relationship. This aligns perfectly with Article 28 letter D of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which enshrines the right of every individual to work and receive just rewards and proper treatment in their employment (Purnomo et al., 2018).

The safeguarding of laborers and workers is a fundamental responsibility of the state to ensure the protection of all its citizens. Each individual, regardless of nationality, possesses inherent human rights that must be upheld and preserved, particularly within the realm of employment, to ensure a dignified existence (Mubarak, 2015). From a legal standpoint, Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower has been established to offer protection to every worker, guided by principles of equality and equal opportunities for obtaining suitable employment and livelihoods. The law explicitly prohibits any form of discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, race, religion, or political beliefs, and mandates fair treatment for all workers, including those with disabilities (Suyanto & Nugroho, 2016).

.

Article 6 of the law also emphasizes the obligation of employers to provide rights and obligations to workers or laborers without discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, race, religion or political opinion. Thus, the law guarantees fair and equal treatment for all workers, thus ensuring that their basic rights are protected without exception (Kahfi, 2016).

In 2020, the Indonesian Government enacted Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation, with the primary objective of fostering widespread and equitable employment opportunities across the nation and ensuring a decent standard of living for its people (Chamdani et al., 2020). This comprehensive law aims to facilitate and protect Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), enhance the investment ecosystem, and streamline the business environment, all while bolstering the welfare of workers. Moreover, the law seeks to reinforce government investments and expedite national strategic projects for the country's development (Jason & Tan, 2020).

Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation combines various regulations that were previously different into one legal umbrella. This includes laws on taxation, employment, forestry, environment, zoning of Indonesian waters, as well as the empowerment of micro, small and medium enterprises, and several other laws that cannot be explained in detail in this context (Anggono, 2020). Through this law, the Government has the view that improvement in Indonesia's national economy which is currently experiencing a decline can be achieved (Setiadi, 2020).

On the other hand, the enactment of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation has received resistance from a large part of Indonesian society with different levels of legal perception, from each community cluster (Maldini et al, 2021). And the cluster of workers and workers is the most directly affected by this law. Several points in the law, such as changes to work agreements, wider contractual permits, and ease

of termination of employment, raise concerns about the protection of workers' rights. They think that this law can weaken the position and welfare of workers (Sarbini, 2021). Each cluster has a different perception, but all clusters of Indonesian citizens have the same goal, namely to reject the existence of the Job Creation Law, especially specifically the arrangements regarding the protection of workers' rights (Mokoginta, 2020).

The Job Creation Law has faced controversy due to the large amount of criticism and rejection from the public. Nonetheless, this law was eventually passed and became the law that applies since it was signed (Purwanto & Lubis, 2020). Furthermore, the focus is on how to implement these basic rules into further regulations, such as government regulations and presidential regulations that support the Job Creation Law. This process is directed at accelerating investment inflows, creating jobs, empowering micro, small and medium enterprises, as well as improving the investment ecosystem and ease of doing business (Setyawan, 2020).

The Job Creation Law basically amends several other laws related to accelerating investment (Hanifah, 2021). This is an initiative of the executive, especially the president of the Republic of Indonesia, with the aim of advancing the economy and creating jobs. This law seeks to provide convenience, protection and empowerment for small and medium enterprises and promote strategic national projects (Greece et al, 2020).

Thus, it is hoped that the implementation of the Job Creation Law will achieve the government's goal of increasing investment, creating jobs, and promoting economic growth in a more efficient manner (Darmawan, 2020). However, it is important to remember that the implementation of this law must also pay attention to the interests and welfare of society at large so that the benefits can be felt by all parties (Annisa, 2020).

This research aims to investigate the implications that the Job Creation Law has for workers' rights in Indonesia. By analyzing various aspects of the changes that occurred after the implementation of this law, this research will identify concrete impacts on workers' rights. It is hoped that this research will make a significant contribution to understanding the impact of the Job Creation Law on labor rights in Indonesia. The results of this research will become a valuable source of information for policy makers, companies and labor unions in formulating steps to address problems and improve labor policies.

2. METHODS

This research will adopt a normative juridical method and a statutory approach to investigate the Implications of the Job Creation Law on the Protection of Labor Rights in Indonesia (Diantha, 2016). Normative juridical research focuses on analyzing legal norms found in laws and regulations, as well as legal principles derived from these laws. It is a qualitative legal research method that relies on secondary data (Diantha, 2016). The statutory approach, on the other hand, aims to identify legal values, principles, and norms that have been practically implemented and developed in society, particularly in relation to the Job Creation Law and its impact on labor rights (Barus, 2013). The legal materials utilized in this normative legal research

include both primary and secondary legal sources. Primary legal materials consist of legal principles and rules, specifically Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower and the Job Creation Law. Meanwhile, secondary legal materials encompass law books, legal journals, expert opinions in the media, legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and online sources (Barus, 2013). The legal books used in this study specifically focus on employment-related topics.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The presence of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation has caused social turmoil in Indonesia, especially because several articles regulate the protection of workers' rights. Indonesian people have diverse legal perceptions of this law, which has led to strong resistance on the view that this law does not provide adequate benefits and protection for Indonesian workers or laborers in contractual relationships with employers (Zubi et al, 2021).

Public rejection of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation is a relevant legal fact in sociological legal studies. From this perspective, the refusal can be considered as data that supports the conclusion that this law still has a number of normative problems, especially in terms of guaranteeing workers' rights. This causes a discrepancy with the legal ideals of Indonesian society (Akmal, 2021).

In the study of sociological law, social, cultural, and community views are important to consider. Widespread rejection from various community groups shows that the Job Creation Law has not fully met their expectations and needs, especially with regard to the protection of workers' rights. Therefore, in its implementation, this law needs to be reviewed and modified so that it is more in line with the demands and aspirations of the people (Dwiyanti et al, 2021).

The Job Creation Law is seen as impartial to the interests of workers, unfair, and only benefits employers. One thing that is causing anxiety from the rejection by the community of the existence of the Job Creation Law, especially regarding guarantees for workers' rights, as revealed by Louis IX King, and friends, in the treatise of unpublished research results is the Job Creation Law, open space for modern slavery through labor flexibility. The implication is that workers no longer have bargaining power to improve working conditions. In addition, the ease with which employers can recruit and fire workers makes working conditions worse (Sjaiful, 2021).

In Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation, Chapter IV concerning Employment, as stipulated in Article 81 states that: "Some of the provisions in Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2003 Number 39, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 4279) amended". This provision is a dogmatic argument that the existence of Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower, in substance several articles will be changed and several articles will be deleted by Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation. Following are some of the implications of the Job Creation Law for the protection of labor rights in Indonesia based on what is regulated in Article 81.

a) Threatened Workers cannot accept orders

The Ciptaker Law, also known as the Job Creation Law, has made significant changes by removing several articles that previously governed the provision of severance pay for workers. This decision has far-reaching consequences for workers, as they are now at risk of not receiving severance pay in crucial situations, such as when they voluntarily resign, face termination of employment (PHK), or even in the unfortunate event of their passing.

First, Article 81 point 51 of the Ciptaker Law has eliminated the provisions of Article 162 in the Manpower Law, which used to outline the rules concerning severance pay for workers who chose to resign from their employment. This article had previously ensured protection for workers who voluntarily left their jobs by guaranteeing them compensation in the form of severance pay. However, the removal of this article now raises concerns that resigning workers might no longer be entitled to receive severance pay, potentially leaving them financially vulnerable when transitioning to new employment.

Second, Article 81 point 52 of the Ciptaker Law has also revoked Article 163 of the Manpower Law, which formerly addressed the provision of severance pay in cases of layoffs resulting from changes in company status, mergers, consolidations, or changes in ownership. This article had previously safeguarded laid-off workers in such circumstances by ensuring they received compensation in the form of severance pay. By removing this article, workers who are laid off due to these events may no longer receive the severance pay that was previously protected by law.

Third, article 81 point 53 of the Ciptaker Law abolishes article 164 of the Manpower Law which previously regulated the provision of severance pay in the event of layoffs as a result of which the company has suffered continuous losses for 2 years or faced force majeure. This article previously provided protection for laid-off workers in the company's difficult economic conditions, where workers had the right to receive severance pay as financial assistance in these difficult situations. With the removal of this article, workers who are laid off for these reasons may no longer receive severance pay.

Fourth, article 81 point 54 of the Ciptaker Law abolishes article 165 of the Manpower Law regarding the provision of severance pay in the event of a layoff due to a company going bankrupt. This article previously provided severance pay for workers who lost their jobs due to the company's bankruptcy. With the abolition of this article, workers affected by company bankruptcy may no longer receive severance pay as a form of protection and compensation.

Fifth, article 81 point 55 of the Ciptaker Law abolishes article 166 of the Manpower Law concerning the provision of severance pay to heirs if workers or laborers die. Previously, this article provided protection for the families of workers who died by providing severance pay to their heirs as financial assistance. With the abolition of this article, the heirs of workers who die may no longer be entitled to the severance pay that was previously guaranteed by law.

The removal of at least five of these articles in the Ciptaker Law regarding severance pay has created uncertainty and ambiguity regarding workers' rights related to severance pay in various critical situations. The impact could potentially

reduce social and financial protection for workers in need, and increase economic instability and workers' welfare in Indonesia.

b) It is easier for foreign workers to enter Indonesia

The Ciptaker Law (Job Creation Law) has brought significant changes regarding the entry of Foreign Workers (TKA) into Indonesia. Several articles in the Ciptaker Law, in particular Article 81 points 4 to 11, amend and delete a number of regulations regarding foreign workers which were previously regulated in Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower.

One significant change introduced by the Ciptaker Law is the elimination of the written permit requirement for employers hiring foreign workers. Under the previous regulation, Article 42 point 1 of the Manpower Law stipulated that employers must obtain written permission from the minister or appointed official to employ foreign workers. However, the Ciptaker Law, in Article 81 point 4, now states that employers only need to have a "plan for the use of foreign workers approved by the central government." As a result, the hiring process for foreign workers has been simplified since employers are no longer obliged to acquire written permission before hiring them.

Another significant change brought about by the Ciptaker Law is the reduction in the number of positions that are off-limits to foreign workers. Previously, Article 46 of the Manpower Law restricted foreign workers from occupying positions in charge of personnel and other positions specified in a ministerial decree. However, Article 81 point 8 of the Ciptaker Law has removed this provision, and now it only prohibits foreign workers from holding positions in charge of personnel. As a result, the opportunities for foreign workers to take up various positions within a company have become more extensive and open.

This change indicates a more flexible policy in allowing foreign workers to work in Indonesia and reduces the administrative requirements that previously applied. The Ciptaker Law aims to attract foreign investment and increase Indonesia's economic competitiveness by facilitating access for companies to employ foreign workers as deemed necessary.

While this change may provide new opportunities for foreign workers and employers in Indonesia, it also raises some concerns. Some critics worry that reducing permit requirements and tightening job restrictions for foreign workers could reduce job opportunities for local workers, as well as potentially causing problems with wages and working conditions for foreign workers working in Indonesia.

The abolition of written permit obligations and changes in the scope of positions that are prohibited for TKA in the Ciptaker Law have become a hot debate among society and among workers in Indonesia. The implementation and actual impact of these changes need to be monitored closely to ensure that the main objectives of this law are still being achieved, while paying attention to the protection and welfare of workers and local workers in Indonesia.

c) Elimination of the maximum limit of contract workers for 3 years.

The changes introduced by the government through the Ciptaker Law regarding the provisions of the Employment Agreement for a Specific Time (PKWT) have sparked controversy. One particular point that has drawn significant attention is

the elimination of the previous maximum limit of 3 years for contract employees, which was governed by Article 59 point 1 of the Labor Law. This article specified that PKWT could only be applied to work that is expected to be completed in a relatively short period and for a maximum duration of 3 years. However, the Ciptaker Law has removed this time restriction, causing debates and discussions about the implications of the change on contract employment arrangements.

Indeed, Article 81 point 15 of the Ciptaker Law has amended the wording of Article 59 of the Manpower Law, resulting in the removal of the specific maximum limit of 3 years for contract employees. The revised article now states that PKWT can only be applied to work that is projected to be completed in the not too distant future. While the removal of the time limit appears evident, it is essential to recognize that the article contains other crucial provisions that require careful consideration and attention. The changes made have implications for the regulation of contract employment, and it is essential to thoroughly assess the potential impacts of these modifications on the rights and welfare of contract employees.

Article 81 point 15 of the Ciptaker Law also introduces a provision that the duration or completion of a specific job will be determined through an employment agreement between the employer and the worker or laborer. This implies that the length of a contract for an employee will be subject to the mutual agreement reached between the employer and the worker or laborer. As a result, employers have the option to offer contract terms exceeding the previous 3-year limit, and it will be the worker's decision to accept and agree to such an arrangement. This change grants employers and employees greater flexibility in determining the duration of their contractual relationship.

This change raises several questions and concerns. By removing the 3 year limit, there is concern that workers or laborers will face uncertainty regarding their employment status. Contracts with longer terms mean workers will face instability in their work and may experience confusion about their rights as contract workers.

In addition, these changes can also cause social and economic impacts. Contract employees who do not have secure job security over a longer period may have difficulty planning for the future and achieving financial stability. This controversy raises concerns about the protection of workers' rights in the new PKWT system. On the one hand, this policy can provide flexibility for companies to organize workforce according to needs, but on the other hand, workers also need certainty and protection of their rights.

The government needs to pay close attention to the implications of this change and ensure that there is an effective monitoring mechanism in place to ensure that workers are not exploited and receive fair treatment in accordance with the agreed work agreements. In addition, dialogue and consultation with various related parties, including trade unions, are important in formulating labor policies that are more inclusive and just.

d) Overtime Hours Added and Long Leaves Lost

Changes in the Ciptaker Law, especially those contained in Article 81 point 22, have changed the rules regarding overtime work which were previously regulated in Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower (Labor Law). Previously, the

Manpower Law stipulated that overtime work could only be done for a maximum of 3 hours in one day and 14 hours in a week.

However, through Article 81 point 22 of the Ciptaker Law, overtime has been extended to a maximum of 4 hours a day and 18 hours a week. This change creates a significant difference in the maximum amount of overtime workers can work. With this extended time, workers will spend more time at work, which means the potential for burnout and disruption of work-life balance is greater.

On the other hand, Article 81 point 79 of the Ciptaker Law has removed the long leave provisions, namely 1 month in the 7th year and 1 month in the 8th year which was previously regulated in the Manpower Law in Article 79 paragraph 4 letter d. Previously, this provision provided the right for workers to get sabbaticals after working for a certain period of time at the company. The abolition of this provision means that workers are no longer guaranteed to get sabbaticals after a certain period of service, which can result in mental and physical fatigue due to heavy workloads without adequate opportunities for rest.

These changes have generated a lot of debate and concern among workers and labor rights activists. Some are concerned that extended overtime may cause workers to experience burnout, stress and even more serious health problems. In addition, the abolition of the right to sabbaticals can reduce the quality of life of workers and disrupt the balance between personal and work life.

In implementing these changes, the government needs to consider the impact on the welfare and health of workers. Protection of workers' rights, including reasonable working hours and the right to leave, is an important aspect of creating a healthy and productive work environment. Dialogue and consultation with workers, trade unions and other stakeholders are needed to ensure that policy changes in the labor sector do not harm workers and remain in favor of achieving social welfare and justice.

e) City/Regency Minimum Wage is abolished

The Ciptaker Law has abolished the Provincial or City/Regency Based Minimum Wage system (UMK) and Sector Based Minimum Wage which were previously regulated in Article 89 of the Manpower Law. Previously, the UMK system and sector-based minimum wages were used to determine the amount of the minimum wage in each province or city/district in Indonesia. This aims to ensure that workers in various regions receive wages that are in accordance with the level of living costs and local economic conditions.

However, the Ciptaker Law introduced changes to the minimum wage regulatory system by including Article Insert 88C. According to the article, governors can set district/city minimum wages with certain conditions. This means that the decision regarding the amount of the minimum wage is now the authority of the governor at the provincial level.

This change reaped various reactions and debates among workers and labor rights activists. Some critics worry that this change could lead to inequality in the wage system, especially for workers in areas with a high cost of living or difficult economic conditions. Abolition of the MSE system can also lead to significant

differences in wages between regions, without taking into account differences in the cost of living and local conditions.

Granting authority to governors to set minimum wages can also lead to uncertainty and potential for abuse of power. Even though there are certain conditions that must be met, the decision making regarding the minimum wage which was originally set based on provincial or city/district parameters can now be influenced by political considerations and the interests of certain parties.

Policy regarding minimum wages is a very sensitive and important issue in creating equality and welfare for workers. There needs to be a strong oversight mechanism and transparency in the minimum wage setting process by governors to ensure that decisions are based on objective considerations and take the interests of workers into account. In addition, dialogue and active participation from trade unions and other stakeholders are also important to achieve justice in the wage system and protect workers' rights in Indonesia.

4. CONCLUSION

Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation has sparked social turmoil in Indonesia, especially because of the controversy surrounding several articles that regulate the protection of workers' rights. Various social clusters reject this law on the view that it does not provide adequate benefits and protection for Indonesian workers or laborers in contractual relationships with employers. From a study of sociological law, this rejection becomes data that supports the conclusion that this law still has normative problems, especially related to guarantees for workers' rights. Some of the implications of this law for the protection of labor rights in Indonesia based on Article 81 are the abolition of several provisions regarding severance pay, ease of entry of foreign workers, abolition of the maximum limit for contract workers, and abolition of the City/Regency Minimum Wage system. These changes led to discontent and criticism from workers and labor rights activists, who argued that the law did not provide adequate protections and benefits for workers. In its implementation, this law needs to be reviewed and modified so that it is more in line with the demands and aspirations of the people as well as safeguarding the protection of workers' rights in Indonesia. Involving trade unions and other stakeholders in the labor policy-making process is important to achieve social justice and prosperity for the whole society.

REFERENCES

1. Adillah, S. U., & Anik, S. (2015). Kebijakan jaminan sosial tenaga kerja sektor informal berbasis keadilan sosial untuk meningkatkan kesejahteraan. *Yustisia Jurnal Hukum*, *4*(3), 558-580.
2. Akmal, D. U. (2021). Dinamika Konsep Omnibus Law: Menegaskan Tujuan Hukum Dalam Konstruksi Legislasi Nasional. *Jurnal Hukum Mimbar Justitia*, *7*(1), 17-40.
3. Anggono, B. D. (2020). Omnibus Law Sebagai Teknik Pembentukan Undang-Undang: Peluang Adopsi Dan Tantangannya Dalam Sistem Perundang-Undangan Indonesia. *Jurnal RechtsVinding*, *9*(1), 17-37.

4. Annisa, O. C. N. (2020). Analisis Dampak Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja Terhadap Hak Pesangon Pemutusan Hubungan Kerja. *Journal Equitable*, *8*(1), 129-143.
5. Barus, Z. (2013). Analisis filosofis tentang peta konseptual penelitian hukum normatif dan penelitian hukum sosiologis. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, *13*(2), 307-318.
6. Chamdani, C., Indradjaja, N., & Ismono, J. (2020). Tinjauan Filosofis Bab Iv Ketenagakerjaan Undang-Undang No. 11 Tahun 2020 Tentang Cipta Kerja. *Wijaya Putra Law Review*, *1*(2), 142-155.
7. Darmawan, A. (2020). Politik Hukum Omnibus Law Dalam Konteks Pembangunan Ekonomi Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Policy Studies*, *1*(1), 13-24.
8. Diantha, I. M. P. (2016). *Metodologi penelitian hukum normatif dalam justifikasi teori hukum*. Prenada Media.
9. Dwiyanti, I. A. S. I., Budiartha, I. N. P., & Widyantara, I. M. M. (2021). Akibat Hukum Tindakan Anarkis Demonstran Terhadap Perusakan Fasilitas Umum dan Penyerangan Petugas Kepolisian (Studi Kasus Penolakan Pengesahan UU Nomor 11 Tahun 2020 Tentang Cipta Kerja). *Jurnal Analogi Hukum*, *3*(2), 251-255.
10. Hanifah, I. (2021). Peluang tenaga kerja asing untuk bekerja di Indonesia berdasarkan rancangan Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja. *De Lega Lata: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *6*(1), 168-173.
11. Jason, F., & Tan, D. (2020). Kepastian Hukum Bagi Penanam Modal Asing Sehubungan dengan Inkonstitusional Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja. *UNES Law Review*, *4*(3), 367-382.
12. Kahfi, A. (2016). Perlindungan hukum terhadap tenaga kerja. *Jurisprudentie: Jurusan Ilmu Hukum Fakultas Syariah dan Hukum*, *3*(2), 59-72.
13. Latupono, B. (2011). Perlindungan Hukum Dan Hak Asasi Manusia Terhadap Pekerja Kontrak (Outsourcing) Di Kota Ambon. *Sasi*, *17*(3), 59-69.
14. Law Number 11 of 2020 Concerning Job Creation.
15. Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower.
16. Maldini, S., Setiawan, A. B., & Santoso, I. B. (2021). Perbandingan Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja Klaster Ketenagakerjaan dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 tentang Ketenagakerjaan mengenai Status Perjanjian Kerja Waktu Tertentu. *Veritas*, *7*(2), 59-69.
17. Mokoginta, A. (2020). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Hak Pekerja Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2020 tentang Cipta Kerja. *Lex Crimen*, *11*(5).
18. Mubarak, R. (2015). Manfaat Pengawasan Bagi Para Buruh (Pekerja). *Jurnal Mercatoria*, *8*(1), 32-45.
19. Purnomo, E. P., Markeling, I. K., & Darmadha, I. N. (2018). Implementasi Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Kecelakaan Kerja Bagi Pekerja Mini Market (Studi Kasus: Indomaret Kebo Iwa Denpasar). *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum*, *1*(7), 1-13.

20. Purwanto, M. E., & Lubis, E. (2020). Yudicial Review Omnibus Law Dalam Melindungi Pekerja dan Mengembangkan Investasi di Indonesia. *VERITAS*, *8*(1), 49-66.
21. Sarbini, S. H. (2021). *Pekerja Alih Daya Dimensi Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja*. Penerbit Lakeisha.
22. Setiadi, W. (2020). Simplifikasi Regulasi dengan Menggunakan Metode Pendekatan Omnibus Law. *Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, *9*(1), 39.
23. Setyawan, Y. (2020). Rancangan Undang-Undang Omnibus Law Cipta Kerja Dalam Perspektif Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 Tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan Keadilan*, *7*(1), 150-164.
24. Sinaga, N. A., & Zaluchu, T. (2021). Perlindungan Hukum Hak-Hak Pekerja Dalam Hubungan Ketenagakerjaan Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Teknologi Industri*, *6*.
25. Sjaiful, M. (2021). Problematika normatif jaminan hak-hak pekerja dalam Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2020 tentang Cipta Kerja. *Media Iuris*, *4*(1), 37.
26. Suyanto, H., & Nugroho, A. A. (2016). Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Hak-hak Pekerja Outsourcing Berdasarkan Asas Keadilan. *Jurnal Yuridis*, *3*(2), 61-74.
27. Yunani, Y., Akhyar, T., & Apriani, R. (2020). Potensi Konflik atas Berlakunya Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2020 Tentang Cipta Kerja. *Jurnal Prodi Ilmu Politik*, *2*(2), 129-144.
28. Zubi, M., Marzuki, M., & Affan, I. (2021). Tinjauan Yuridis Perlindungan Hak-Hak Normatif Tenaga Kerja Setelah Berlakunya Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja (Omnibus Law). *Jurnal Ilmiah METADATA*, *3*(3), 1171-1195.