

The Realization of Mood Structure in Worker Positioning in the Job Creation Law Number 11 of 2020

**Nur Indah Sholikhati¹,
Riyadi Santosa²,
Djatkika³,
Tri Wiratno⁴**

¹⁾ Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

^{2, 3, 4)} Universitas Sebelas Maret

nur.indah.sholikhati@unsoed.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to uncover the positioning of workers in Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation, specifically in the employment cluster, through mood structure within a Systemic Functional Linguistics analysis framework. The approach used is descriptive qualitative with content analysis methods. Data in the form of clauses in Chapter IV on Employment are analyzed based on Subject and Finite components to identify the mood types and modalities used. The results show that the mood structure in the Job Creation Law is dominated by the indicative-declarative type, which functions as both legal determination and information delivery. Grammatically, the subjects in clauses are mostly filled by authoritative entities such as the government, governors, and employers, while workers tend to be positioned as objects or complements in the clause structure. Furthermore, the use of modality shows an imbalance, where high modalities such as “must” are more often used in obligations, while medium modalities such as “can” appear in the regulation of workers' rights, potentially giving rise to legal ambiguity. These findings indicate the existence of an asymmetrical power relationship in legal texts, where workers are positioned as passive participants. Therefore, linguistic aspects of regulatory companies need to be considered to create fairer representation in industrial relations.

Keywords: systemic functional linguistics, mood structure, legal language, job creation law, power relations

INTRODUCTION

Language is a primary instrument in the formation and

implementation of law. Through language, the state constructs norms, regulates citizen behavior, and establishes binding social relations between various parties within the regulatory sphere. In this context, law is understood not only as a set of normative rules but also as a social practice manifested through the use of language. Therefore, legal language is never neutral, as every lexical and grammatical choice used in a regulation has the potential to represent specific interests, ideologies, and power relations (Fairclough, 1995).

Legal language has distinct characteristics compared to other language varieties. Legal language is required to provide certainty, firmness, and binding force, thus tending to use formal, declarative, and normative sentence structures. However, various studies show that legal language often contains ambiguity, multiple interpretations, and even unequal representation of the parties regulated by the regulation (Singh, 2012; Solan, 2018). The choice of language in legal documents not only serves to convey legal provisions but also plays a role in shaping the social positions of the participants involved (Wagner & Cacciaguidi, 2006).

In recent decades, the study of legal language has developed rapidly through approaches such as forensic linguistics and critical discourse analysis. Both approaches view legal texts as social arenas where negotiations of power, ideology, and the interests of particular groups take place (Coulthard & Johnson, 2010). Legal language is seen as an instrument that not only reflects social reality but also helps shape that reality through the construction of meaning legitimized by the state. Therefore, analyzing the linguistic structure of legal documents is crucial for understanding how a regulation represents the parties involved.

One regulation that has sparked widespread debate in Indonesia is Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation. This law was drafted with the primary goal of increasing investment, expanding employment opportunities, and encouraging national economic growth by simplifying various regulations deemed to hinder business activities. Nevertheless, from its deliberations to its enactment, the Job Creation Law has generated considerable controversy, particularly regarding provisions in the employment cluster. Various worker groups and labor unions believe that a number of the changes have the potential to reduce normative protections for workers previously stipulated in Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower.

The debate over the Job Creation Law has focused largely on the legal substance, economic implications, and social impacts. Meanwhile, the linguistic aspects used in drafting the regulation have received relatively little attention. Yet, language is the primary medium used to construct legal provisions and determines how the parties involved are represented in the regulation. From a linguistic perspective, this representation can be observed through the choice of grammatical structures used in legal texts.

One relevant approach to studying representation in legal language is Systemic Functional Linguistics (FSL), developed by Halliday (1994) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2014). The LSF views language as a social semiotic resource used to construct meaning in specific contexts. According to Halliday, every use of language simultaneously realizes three metafunctions: the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions. The interpersonal metafunction relates to how speakers or writers establish social relationships with readers through their grammatical choices.

Within the interpersonal metafunction, the mood system is one of the primary tools used to realize the relationship between speaker and interlocutor. Mood is realized through the configuration of Subject and Finite elements, which form the basis of the exchange of meaning within a clause (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). Through the mood system, a text can construct relationships of power, authority, obligations, and rights held by specific participants. Therefore, analyzing mood structures allows researchers to uncover how a regulation positions the parties it regulates.

In the context of legal texts, mood structures are generally realized in declarative form because regulations are designed to convey binding provisions. However, behind this declarative form lies a variety of modalities that indicate levels of obligation, prohibition, permission, and possibility. Modalities such as “obligatory” (*wajib*), “must” (*harus*), “can” (*dapat*), and “prohibited” (*dilarang*) not only function as grammatical markers but also reflect the distribution of power constructed within legal texts (Martin & White, 2005). Thus, mood and modality analysis can be used to identify how the state constructs the relationship between the government, employers, and workers in employment regulations.

Several previous studies have utilized a Systemic Functional Linguistics approach to examine legal texts and public policies. Surbakti, Sinar, and Setia (2018) found that the choice of evaluation sources and the level of modality in the Electronic Information and Transactions Law play a role in constructing state authority over society. Sinaga, Sinar, and Setia (2020) showed that the transitivity structure in the 1945 Constitution represents a distinct distribution of social roles between the state and citizens. Meanwhile, Khatimah et al. (2021), through a forensic linguistic study of the Corruption Eradication Commission Law, found that linguistic choices in regulations can yield diverse interpretations and influence the positions of the legal actors involved.

However, research specifically examining the mood structure in the Job Creation Law remains very limited. Most research on the Job Creation Law focuses on legal, economic, and public policy aspects, while linguistic analysis of the construction of relationships between the government, employers, and workers is scarce. Furthermore, there is little research linking mood analysis to the issue of worker positioning in legal texts. Yet,

mood structure has the potential to reveal how workers are represented as actors, recipients of actions, beneficiaries, or even simply objects of regulation in labor regulations.

Based on this description, this study aims to analyze the realization of mood structure in Chapter IV of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation and to reveal how workers are positioned through the choice of mood structure and modality used. Through a Systemic Functional Linguistics approach and a critical discourse paradigm, this research is expected to contribute to the development of legal linguistics studies while enriching understanding of the relationship between language, power, and worker representation in labor regulations in Indonesia.

METHOD

This research uses Systemic Functional Linguistics (FSL) as the primary theoretical basis for examining the positioning of workers in Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation. SFS was developed by M. A. K. Halliday, who views language not simply as a system of grammatical rules but as a social semiotic resource used by humans to construct and exchange meaning in specific social contexts. From this perspective, the form of language a person uses is always influenced by social goals, relationships between participants, and the cultural context in which the language is used.

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), language simultaneously realizes three main metafunctions: the ideational metafunction, the interpersonal metafunction, and the textual metafunction. The ideational metafunction relates to the representation of experience and social reality. The interpersonal metafunction relates to the social relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor. The textual metafunction organizes messages so that they can be understood coherently within a communication context.

In this study, the analysis focuses on interpersonal metafunctions because the aim is to uncover how workers are positioned in legal texts through the choice of mood structures used by legislators. This study uses a qualitative descriptive approach with a critical discourse paradigm to uncover the positioning of workers in Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation, specifically in Chapter IV concerning Employment. This paradigm was chosen because it allows researchers to interpret the relationship between linguistic choices and power relations represented in the legal text. This research is an embedded case study with a single case focusing on language construction in employment regulations. The research focuses on the realization of mood and modality structures as linguistic devices that construct the representation of workers in legal texts.

The analytical framework for this study uses Systemic Functional Linguistics (FSL) developed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014),

specifically the interpersonal metafunction. From the LSF perspective, language is viewed as a social semiotic resource used to construct meaning in specific contexts. The interpersonal metafunction is realized through the mood system realized by the Subject and Finite elements in clauses. This system allows for the identification of social relations, the distribution of authority, and the patterns of meaning exchange constructed within the text. Furthermore, this study analyzes the use of modality, as it indicates the level of obligation, prohibition, permission, and possibility inherent in a legal provision. Mood and modality analysis is used to explain how workers are represented and how power relations between the state, employers, and workers are constructed through legal language (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Martin & White, 2005).

The research data source is Chapter IV on Employment in Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation, while Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Employment serves as comparative data to strengthen the interpretation of changes in worker representation in employment regulations. The research data consists of clauses contained in Chapter IV on Employment. All clauses found were sampled using a total sampling technique, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of all linguistic constructions that construct worker representation. Data collection was conducted through document analysis, identifying clause units containing mood and modality structures relevant to the research objectives. To strengthen data interpretation, this study also utilized Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) involving linguistic and legal experts.

Data validity was maintained through source and method triangulation. Source triangulation was conducted by comparing data from the Job Creation Law, the Manpower Law, and discussions with expert informants. Meanwhile, method triangulation was conducted through a combination of document analysis and FGDs to obtain a more comprehensive interpretation. Data analysis refers to Spradley's ethnographic model modified by Santosa, including domain analysis, taxonomic analysis, componential analysis, and cultural theme analysis. Domain analysis was used to identify all relevant data, taxonomic analysis to group data based on mood categories, componential analysis to identify relationships between categories, and cultural theme analysis to uncover ideological meanings and power relations represented through the mood structures in the Job Creation Law.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

An analysis of the 270 clauses in Chapter IV of Law No. 11 of 2020 concerning Manpower shows that all clauses are realized through the indicative-declarative mood. Based on their function of exchanging meaning, these clauses are divided into 201 propositions and 69 proposals.

Table 1:
Distribution of Mood Structure in *Law No. 11 of 2020, Chapter IV of Manpower*

Genre Text	Mood Structure	
	Proposition	Proposal
<i>Umum</i>	0	3
<i>Ketenagakerjaan</i>	143	54
<i>Jenis Program Jaminan Sosial</i>	3	1
<i>Jaminan Kehilangan Pekerjaan</i>	12	1
<i>Badan Penyelenggara Jaminan Sosial</i>	10	0
<i>Pelindungan Pekerja Migran Indonesia</i>	33	10
Total	201	69

These findings indicate that the legal text in the Job Creation Law is predominantly constructed through an information-giving function. Within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics, propositions are used to exchange information regarding facts, conditions, definitions, and provisions deemed true by regulators (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The dominance of propositions indicates that the state seeks to establish regulatory legitimacy by presenting various provisions as normative facts that must be accepted by readers.

Although all clauses are realized in declarative form, the interpersonal function constructed is not entirely informative. In legal texts, declaratives function as institutional means to establish legally binding norms. Thus, the seemingly neutral declarative form actually contains strong regulative power because it originates from state institutions that have the authority to regulate social life.

The existence of 69 proposals indicates that the legal text not only explains the employment system but also regulates actions that must, may, or may not be taken by participants. Proposals in the legal text are manifested through the use of modalities such as “obligatory” (*wajib*), “must” (*harus*), “can” (*dapat*), and “prohibited” (*dilarang*). Through these modalities, the state establishes control mechanisms for industrial relations and distributes rights and obligations to the parties involved.

1. Positioning Workers through Propositions

All 201 clauses in Chapter IV of the Employment Law are realized as propositions. In Systemic Functional Linguistics, a proposition is a form of exchange of information, namely the exchange of meaning oriented towards conveying specific information, definitions, or conditions (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In this category, legal texts function to build a conceptual framework that explains how the employment system should be understood. Interestingly, the analysis shows that workers rarely occupy

the subject position in the mood structure. Instead, workers are more often represented as part of the legal conditions, objects of definition, or elements protected by the system.

Table 2:
Data 1

<i>perjanjian kerja</i>	<i>berakhir</i>	<i>apabila pekerja/buruh meninggal dunia</i>
S	F	P
Mood		Residu
Actor	Material process	Circ. Condition

CK/2/K/psl.61(1)

This clause is realized through a declarative mood with the subject “*perjanjian kerja*” and the finite “*berakhir*”. Interpersonally, the clause functions to convey the normative conditions regarding the termination of the employment relationship. Interestingly, the worker does not appear as the subject, but rather as part of the circumstance of condition introduced through the conjunction “*apabila*”.

From the LSF perspective, this grammatical position indicates that the worker is not the controller of the action, but rather the condition that triggers changes in the legal status of the employment relationship. In other words, the worker is represented not as a social agent, but as a conditional element within a legal mechanism. This structure demonstrates the tendency of legal language to place workers within an administrative and procedural framework.

From a social representation perspective, the worker's death is treated as a legal event that triggers certain consequences for the employment contract. The primary focus is not on the worker as a person, but rather on the legal status of the employment agreement itself. Thus, the text prioritizes the continuity of the legal system over the worker's individual experience.

Table 3:
Data 2

<i>Perjanjian kerja</i>	<i>tidak berakhir</i>	<i>karena meninggalnya pengusaha atau beralihnya hak atas perusahaan yang disebabkan penjualan, pewarisan, atau hibah.</i>
S	F	P
Mood		Residu
Actor	Material process	Circ. Cause

CK/2/K/psl.61(2)

This data demonstrates the use of the finite negative “*tidak berakhir*” which serves to emphasize the continuity of the employment relationship

despite a change in company ownership. Unlike Data 1, the primary focus of this clause is the stability of the employment system. Although workers are not explicitly mentioned, their existence implicitly provides a reason why the employment relationship must be maintained.

Interpersonally, workers are again not in the subject position. The employment relationship is represented as an institution that stands above the individuals involved. Even the death of the employer is not considered sufficient to end the employment relationship because the legal system prioritizes the continuity of the company. This finding suggests that workers are positioned as part of an institutional structure larger than themselves. The employment relationship is understood as a legal relationship whose continuity is guaranteed by the state, not determined by individual actors.

Table 4:
Data 3

<i>Pelindungan pekerja/buruh, upah dan kesejahteraan, syarat-syarat kerja, serta perselisihan yang timbul</i>	<i>dilaksanakan</i>	<i>sekurang-kurangnya sesuai dengan ketentuan peraturan perundang-undangan</i>
S	F	P
Mood	Residu	
Goal	Material Process	Circ. Manner

CK/2/K/psl.66(2)

This data shows a distinct pattern. The subject is filled with abstract concepts such as “*pelindungan pekerja/buruh, upah dan kesejahteraan, syarat-syarat kerja, serta perselisihan yang timbul*”. The use of the passive form “*dilaksanakan*” causes the doer of the action to be omitted from the clause structure.

From the LSF perspective, agent deletion is a grammatical strategy frequently found in legal language. This strategy allows regulations to highlight actions or policies without necessarily naming the parties responsible for implementing them. As a result, workers are represented as objects of protection, rather than as actors fighting for their own protection. Protection appears to be something granted to workers by the legal system, rather than as a result of their active participation. Ideologically, this structure establishes a paternalistic relationship, where the state is positioned as the protector while workers are the recipients of that protection.

Table 5:
Data 4

<i>dalam</i> <i>Undang-Undang ini</i>	<i>yang</i> <i>dimaksud</i> <i>Calon</i> <i>Pekerja</i> <i>Migran</i> <i>Indonesia</i>	<i>adalah</i>	<i>setiap tenaga kerja Indonesia yang memenuhi syarat sebagai pencari kerja yang akan bekerja di luar negeri dan terdaftar di instansi pemerintah kabupaten/ kota yang bertanggung jawab di bidang ketenagakerjaan</i>	
Adj	S	F	P	Comp
Re-	Mood	-sidu		
Circ.	Token	Relasional	Value	
Lokasi		Identifying		
		Proses		

CK/5/PPMI/psl.1

This clause utilizes a relational identification process with finite “*adalah*”. In this structure, “*Calon Pekerja Migran Indonesia*” function as Tokens, while their definitions serve as Values.

Interpersonally, this clause demonstrates how the state defines workers' identities through specific legal categories. Workers lack the space to define themselves because their identities are shaped through classifications established by regulations.

From a critical discourse perspective, legal definitions constitute a form of symbolic power because they determine who is or is not included in a social category. Through these definitions, the state gains the authority to establish legal boundaries that determine a person's access to certain rights and protections. The four data propositions demonstrate a consistent pattern: workers are more often represented as objects of definition, objects of protection, or elements of conditions rather than as primary actors in interpersonal structures.

2. Positioning Workers through Proposals

Unlike propositions, proposals function as an exchange of goods and services because they contain demands for specific actions. The research data identified 69 proposals characterized by the use of modality “obligatory” (*wajib*), “can” (*dapat*), and “prohibited” (*dilarang*). These modalities indicate the level of state control over the behavior of participants in industrial relations.

Table 6:

Data 5

<i>Pemberi kerja orang perseorangan</i>	<i>dilarang mempekerjakan</i>	<i>tenaga kerja asing.</i>
S	F	P
Mood	Residu	
Aktor	Material Process	Goal

CK/2/K/psl.42(2)

This clause uses a declarative mood with the Finite “*dilarang*” indicating a negative modality with high power, so it is functionally included in the proposal category. From the LSF perspective, prohibition is a strong form of social control in the exchange of actions, because it strictly limits what participants are not allowed to do. The subject in this clause is the employer, who is positioned as an actor subject to direct regulation. Meanwhile, foreign workers appear as the object of the prohibited actions, thus becoming the focus of restrictions in the policy. Implicitly, local workers are not mentioned, but are protected through these restrictions, indicating an indirect protection strategy. Thus, this clause reflects a top-down power relationship, where the state controls the actions of employers to regulate labor dynamics.

Table 7:
Data 6

Pengusaha	wajib membayar	upah	kepada pekerja/ buruh	sesuai dengan kesepakatan
S	F	P	Compl.	Adj.
Mood	Residu			
Aktor	Material Proses	Goal	Circ. Beneficiary	Circ. Manner

CK/2/K/psl.88A(3)

This clause uses the finite “*wajib*” indicating a high level of obligation, and is therefore included in the proposal. Within the LSF framework, this clause represents a form of exchange that requires employers to pay wages. The “*pengusaha*” is positioned as the primary actor bearing the obligation, while the worker is positioned as the beneficiary. This structure suggests that workers do not play an active role in the action but rather receive the results of the action. Nevertheless, the existence of this clause demonstrates the existence of legal protection for workers in the economic aspect. Thus, this proposal serves as an instrument of protection and regulation of employment relations.

Table 8:
Data 7

<i>Pengusaha</i>	<i>dilarang membayar</i>	<i>upah lebih rendah dari upah minimum</i>	
S	F	P	Compl.
Mood	Residu		
Actor	Material Proses	Goal	

CK/2/K/psl.88E(2)

The use of the finite “*dilarang*” in this clause indicates that paying wages below the minimum standard is prohibited. From the LSF's perspective, this prohibition represents a proposal with high regulatory power. The “*pengusaha*” returns to being an actor controlled by the rules, while workers emerge not as subjects but as protected parties. This structure demonstrates that worker protection is achieved through restrictions on employer actions. Thus, workers are positioned as objects of legal protection dependent on the compliance of others. This clause emphasizes the state's active role in maintaining workers' welfare standards.

Table 9:
Data 8

<i>Gubernur</i>	<i>wajib menetapkan</i>	<i>upah minimum provinsi</i>
S	F	P
Mood		Residu
Behaver	Mental Beh. Process	Phenomenon
		Compl

CK/2/K/psl.88C(1)

This clause indicates that regional government authority is regulated through the modality “*wajib*”, which signifies a binding obligation. Within the LSF framework, this clause constitutes a proposal because it demands action that must be taken by the governor. Workers do not appear explicitly in the clause structure, but are directly impacted by the policy. This suggests that worker welfare is determined through structural policies created by the government. Thus, workers are positioned as policy recipients, not decision-makers. This structure reflects the state's dominance in regulating the wage system. This represents a proposal with strong normative pressure, where the state explicitly instructs specific actions as part of employment policy. This contrasts with the data using the low obligation modality below.

Table 10:
Data 9

<i>Gubernur</i>	<i>dapat</i> <i>menetapkan</i>	<i>upah minimum</i> <i>kabupaten/ kota</i>	<i>dengan syarat</i> <i>tertentu</i>
S	F	P	Compl.
Mood		Residu	
Behaver	Mental Beh. Proses	Fenomenon	Circ. Manner

CK/2/K/psl.88C(2)

Based on the data above, the use of modalities “*dapat*” (can) indicate a degree of possibility or permission (low obligation), which gives the governor discretion to implement or not implement the action. In this case, the clause remains a proposal, but is more flexible and not absolutely binding. The additional phrase “*dengan syarat tertentu*” further emphasizes that the implementation of the action is dependent on certain conditions, thus reinforcing the optional nature of the modality.

From an interpersonal perspective, the clauses in Data 8 and Data 9 both position the governor as the primary subject or actor, but the power relationships they establish differ. In clauses with the word “*wajib*”, the relationship is hierarchical and directive because there is no room for negotiation regarding the ordered action. Meanwhile, in clauses with the word “*dapat*”, the relationship is more open to negotiation because it offers the possibility of choice based on certain conditions.

The implications for worker positioning also differ. In clause 8, workers are positioned as having more secure rights because the policy is binding. Conversely, in clause 9, with the “*dapat*” modal, worker protection becomes more contingent (dependent on decisions and conditions) and thus less robust than in the obligation modal. Thus, the differences in the use of these modalities demonstrate how legal language not only conveys rules but also regulates the level of certainty and strength of worker protection.

Table 11:
Data 10

<i>Tenaga kerja</i> <i>asing</i>	<i>dilarang</i> <i>menduduki</i>	<i>jabatan yang mengurus</i> <i>personalia</i>
S	F	P
Mood		Residu
Actor	Material Process	Goal

CK/2/K/psl.42(5)

Structurally, this clause positions “*tenaga kerja asing*” as the subject, meaning that this entity is the primary focus of the interpersonal construction. The finite “*dilarang*” indicates a negative modality with a high degree of force, categorizing it as a proposal because it contains a demand

for action in the form of a prohibition. The use of this modality indicates that the act of "*menduduki jabatan tertentu*" is expressly prohibited, thus establishing clear behavioral boundaries for participants.

From a positioning perspective, foreign workers are positioned as directly restricted actors, possessing agency controlled by regulations. Meanwhile, local workers are not explicitly mentioned, but implicitly benefit because this prohibition opens up opportunities for them to occupy such positions. This clause demonstrates a control function that limits the freedom of movement of certain workers. Thus, the proposal also functions as a restrictive mechanism within the employment system.

From an interpersonal perspective, the use of the declarative mood to convey the proposal indicates that the law does not use the imperative form directly, but instead packages the command in the form of a statement. This strategy reinforces the impression of objectivity and legitimacy, while maintaining institutional authority. However, when the mood structure functions as a proposal, characterized by the use of modalities such as "obligatory" (*wajib*), "must" (*harus*), and "prohibited" (*dilarang*) a shift in the degree of negotiation is observed. At this point, the relationship between participants becomes unequal because the text no longer simply conveys information but contains binding demands for action. Thus, in the context of this law, the state plays not only a role as a transmitter of information but also as an authority that regulates and controls the behavior of other participants, including workers, so that the resulting interpersonal relationships tend to be hierarchical and top-down.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the realization of mood structure in Chapter IV on Employment of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation and examined how workers are positioned through the interpersonal meanings constructed in the legal text. The findings reveal that all clauses in the employment chapter are realized through the indicative-declarative mood, reflecting the formal and authoritative nature of legal discourse. Of the 270 clauses analyzed, 201 functions as propositions and 69 function as proposals. The dominance of propositions indicates that the law primarily operates through the provision of normative information, definitions, and legal conditions, while proposals function to regulate actions through obligations, prohibitions, and permissions.

The analysis of propositions demonstrates that workers are predominantly positioned as entities that are defined, regulated, protected, or affected by legal provisions rather than as active social actors. In many clauses, workers appear as goals, beneficiaries, complements, or objects of legal definition, whereas institutional actors such as the government, governors, employers, and regulatory bodies occupy the Subject position. This pattern suggests that workers are represented within an institutional

framework established by the state rather than as participants with significant agency in the construction of employment relations.

Similarly, the analysis of proposals shows that legal obligations and prohibitions are primarily directed toward employers and government authorities. While many of these provisions are designed to protect workers' rights, workers themselves rarely appear as the primary actors within the clause structure. Instead, they are frequently positioned as beneficiaries of actions performed by others. Furthermore, the use of modality reflects varying degrees of legal certainty. High-obligation modalities such as *wajib* (must) and *dilarang* (prohibited) create strong regulatory force, whereas lower-obligation modalities such as *dapat* (may/can) introduce flexibility and reduce the certainty of protection in specific contexts.

Taken together, these findings indicate that the employment chapter of the Job Creation Law constructs an asymmetrical relationship between institutional authorities and workers. The government and employers are consistently represented as active decision-makers and policy implementers, while workers are more often represented as recipients of regulation and protection. From the perspective of Systemic Functional Linguistics, the distribution of Subject roles, mood structures, and modalities reflects a hierarchical and top-down pattern of interpersonal relations within the legal text. Consequently, mood structure functions not merely as a grammatical resource but also as a discursive mechanism through which legal authority and power relations are constructed and maintained.

This study highlights the importance of examining linguistic choices in legal drafting because grammatical structures contribute to the representation of social actors and the distribution of power within legal discourse. Future studies may extend this analysis by comparing the Job Creation Law with previous employment regulations or by integrating mood analysis with transitivity and appraisal systems to provide a more comprehensive understanding of worker representation in Indonesian legal texts.

REFERENCES

- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.

- Khatimah, H., Prayoga, R. A., Amril, A., & Azhar, A. (2021). Analisis linguistik forensik terhadap Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2002 tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 8(1), 63–72.
- Malcolm Coulthard, & Alison Johnson (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Santosa, R. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Sinaga, E. B., Sinar, T. S., & Setia, E. (2020). Analisis transitivitas pada teks Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 sebelum amandemen. *Linguistika: Buletin Ilmiah Program Magister Linguistik Universitas Udayana*, 27(1), 1–12.
- Singh, H. (2012). Language of law: Ambiguities and interpretation. *International Journal of Law and Language Studies*, 3(2), 45–58.
- Solan, L. M. (2018). The interpretation of legal language. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 4, 337–355. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011817-045818>
- Surbakti, E. B., Sinar, T. S., & Setia, E. (2018). Engagement and graduation in text of the law on electronic information and transaction. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 5(4), 360–369.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2020 tentang Cipta Kerja. (2020). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2020 tentang Cipta Kerja*. Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 tentang Ketenagakerjaan. (2003). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 tentang Ketenagakerjaan*. Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Wagner, A., & Cacciaguidi, S. (2006). *Legal language and the search for clarity: Practice and tools*. Peter Lang.