RECHTSVINDING
Vol. 4, 2 (July-December, 2026), pp. 535-544
EISSN: 2987-4424, DOI: https://doi.org/10.59525/rechtsvinding.2225

State Responsibility for Guaranteeing the Protection of Workers' Normative Rights After Termination of Employment

Muhammad Zubir

STAI Nusantara, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

state responsibility;
legal protection;
normative rights;
termination of employment;
job loss benefit

Article history:

Received 2025-09-15
Revised 2026-10-23
Accepted 2026-11-27

ABSTRACT

Termination of employment (PHK) cuts off a worker's income and frequently leads to the neglect of normative rights such as severance pay, long-service pay, compensation for entitlements, outstanding wages, and social security benefits. This article examines the constitutional basis of the state's responsibility to protect these rights after termination, the forms of legal protection available, and the obstacles to their enforcement. Using normative legal research with statutory and conceptual approaches, it analyses the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 27 of 2026 on Labour Protection, Law No. 2 of 2004 on Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement, and the Job Loss Benefit (JKP) regulations as amended by Government Regulation No. 6 of 2025. The findings show that the state's responsibility, read through the obligations to respect, protect, and fulfil, extends beyond law-making to labour inspection, law enforcement, accessible dispute settlement, and social protection for dismissed workers. Protection operates on three layers—substantive, procedural, and social—yet its effectiveness is weakened by unequal bargaining power, limited inspection capacity, low legal literacy, and slow, costly dispute settlement and execution of judgments. Law No. 27 of 2026 offers a momentum for reform only if its implementing regulations, inspection capacity, and institutional coordination are promptly strengthened.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license.

Corresponding Author:
Muhammad Zubir
STAI Nusantara, Indonesia; e-mail@e-mail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

An employment relationship is a legal relationship formed by an agreement between a worker and an employer and comprises three essential elements: work, wages, and instruction. These elements give rise to the respective rights and obligations of the parties in carrying out business activities and production processes. The worker is obliged to perform the work as agreed, while the employer is obliged to pay wages and fulfil the worker's rights as stipulated in statutory regulations. Although the employment relationship originates from an agreement, it cannot be regarded merely as a private

contractual relationship between equal parties. In reality, workers often occupy a weaker social and economic position than employers, particularly in terms of control over capital, access to information, and the ability to determine the terms of employment. This imbalance gives labour law its protective character, namely the provision of special protection to workers so that they are not exploited or treated unfairly. State involvement in regulating employment relations is therefore a legal necessity to ensure a balance between the interests of employers and the protection of workers' rights (Wiryadi & Novendra, 2021).

From the perspective of industrial relations, the principles of balance, justice, and legal certainty must serve as the main foundation for regulating relations among workers, employers, and the government. These principles are required not only while the employment relationship is in force but must also be guaranteed when it ends. One of the issues most prone to injustice in industrial relations is termination of employment (pemutusan hubungan kerja, PHK). Termination is the ending of an employment relationship, which may result from various circumstances such as corporate efficiency measures, organisational restructuring, business losses, mergers or acquisitions, and technological developments that change labour needs. Under certain conditions, termination is indeed unavoidable as part of the dynamics and sustainability of economic activity. Nevertheless, a company's decision to end an employment relationship must not disregard the rights that workers have acquired during that relationship. Termination must therefore be carried out on lawful grounds and through lawful procedures, accompanied by the fulfilment of all of the employer's obligations towards the affected workers (Ahmadi, Muhibbin, & Utami, 2026).

The fulfilment of workers' rights after termination is a legal consequence inseparable from the end of the employment relationship. These rights include severance pay, long-service pay, compensation for entitlements, as well as wages and other rights that the company has not yet paid. They serve an important function both as recognition of the worker's period of service and as economic protection against the loss of income (Husni, 2014). In practice, however, the fulfilment of these normative rights still faces various problems. Many workers experience delays in the payment of severance, receive payments that do not comply with the applicable provisions, or do not receive proper compensation at all. Further problems arise from the unclear status of social security membership after termination. These conditions show that the end of an employment relationship is not always followed by adequate economic protection for workers (Azhar, Silitonga, & Solechan, 2022).

The problem of fulfilling post-termination rights is also closely related to the unequal bargaining power between workers and employers. Workers who lose their jobs are generally in an unstable economic situation because their main source of income has ceased. In such circumstances, the need to cover living costs, children's education, health care, and other basic needs often pushes workers to accept dispute settlements that do not fully comply with the law. This shows that the recognition of workers' normative rights in legislation does not necessarily guarantee their effective implementation. Several studies reveal a gap between normative legal protection and the reality of how workers' rights are fulfilled in industrial relations practice (Bonang & Lie, 2025). Consequently, the protection of workers after termination cannot be resolved solely by regulating the employer's obligations; it also requires mechanisms of inspection, law enforcement, dispute settlement, and social support that can secure the continuity of workers' lives after job loss.

The protection of workers after termination rests on a strong constitutional foundation. Article 27(2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia affirms that every citizen has the right to work and to a livelihood befitting human dignity. This provision establishes that work is not merely an economic activity but part of the realisation of human dignity and welfare. Furthermore, Article 28D(2) guarantees

the right of every person to work and to receive fair and decent remuneration and treatment in an employment relationship. This constitutional guarantee implies that workers must be treated fairly, including when facing termination. Article 28H(3) guarantees the right of every person to social security that enables their full development as a dignified human being. This is reinforced by Article 34(2), which mandates the state to develop a social security system for all people and to empower the weak and the poor in accordance with human dignity (Fitriani, Satria, Astono, Sitorus, & Utomo, 2022).

This constitutional foundation shows that the state's responsibility to protect workers does not end with enacting regulations on employment relations but extends to ensuring that workers' rights are fulfilled when they are dismissed. This responsibility is also in line with Indonesia's commitment to human rights, as reflected in its ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) through Law No. 11 of 2005. The Covenant recognises the right to work and the right to social security as economic, social, and cultural rights that the state must respect, protect, and fulfil. Accordingly, the state is obliged to develop policies that enable everyone to obtain protection when they lose their job, including through compensation, access to social security, and programmes for recovery and the expansion of employment opportunities. Post-termination worker protection must therefore be understood as part of the state's constitutional duty to realise social justice and public welfare (Harahap, Ramadhan, Milen, Anshory, & Harahap, 2023).

The urgency of such protection has grown alongside the development of and changes to Indonesian labour regulation. The restructuring of labour law following Constitutional Court Decision No. 168/PUU-XXI/2023 demonstrates the importance of reforming legal norms to provide legal certainty and strengthen worker protection. Within the regulatory developments that form the context of this study, attention is also directed to Law No. 27 of 2026 on Labour Protection, reported to have entered into force on 28 October 2026, and to the revision of the Job Loss Benefit (Jaminan Kehilangan Pekerjaan, JKP) programme through Government Regulation No. 6 of 2025. These legal instruments show that worker protection concerns not only the payment of financial entitlements arising from termination but also the continuity of workers' social and economic lives after job loss. The JKP programme, for example, is an important social protection instrument that helps workers through the transition period by means of the benefits provided under the applicable regulations (Kamil & Gunadi, 2025).

Nevertheless, the existence of these regulations and protection programmes does not automatically guarantee the optimal fulfilment of workers' rights. The effectiveness of protection is still influenced by the capacity of labour inspection, corporate compliance, workers' access to legal information, the effectiveness of industrial relations dispute settlement, and the quality of social security administration. Previous studies have tended to discuss the payment of severance in specific cases or to analyse worker protection under the Job Creation Law regime (Harahap et al., 2023; Kamil & Gunadi, 2025). Meanwhile, research on the Job Loss Benefit has focused mostly on programme design and the implementation of social protection in isolation (Wiryadi & Novendra, 2021; Azhar et al., 2022). Studies that integrate the state's constitutional responsibility, the fulfilment of workers' normative rights, and socio-economic recovery after termination still need to be developed, even though these three aspects form a single whole that determines the quality of legal protection for workers.

Against this background, this study analyses the state's constitutional responsibility to protect workers' rights after termination of employment. Its focus lies not only on the regulation of the normative rights that constitute the employer's obligations but also on the role of the state in guaranteeing the realisation of those rights through regulation, inspection, law enforcement, and the social security system. The study also seeks to identify the obstacles that prevent legal protection from operating effectively,

whether in terms of legal substance, institutional structure, or workers' awareness of and access to legal mechanisms. By employing a constitutional and labour law perspective, the study is expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between state obligations and the protection of workers facing the risk of job loss. Specifically, it addresses three research questions: first, what are the basis and scope of the state's constitutional responsibility to protect workers' normative rights after termination; second, what forms of legal protection are available to workers after termination; and third, what obstacles affect the effectiveness of such protection and what strategies can overcome them. Through these three foci, the study is expected to contribute academically to the development of labour law and to serve as a consideration in formulating worker protection policies that are fairer, more effective, and welfare-oriented (Suandika, 2020).

2. METHODS

This study is normative legal research that examines the norms, principles, and legal doctrines relating to the protection of workers after termination of employment, using a statute approach and a conceptual approach (Marzuki, 2017). The primary legal materials comprise the 1945 Constitution; Law No. 27 of 2026 on Labour Protection; Law No. 2 of 2004 on Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement; Law No. 40 of 2004 on the National Social Security System; Law No. 21 of 2003 on the Ratification of ILO Convention No. 81; Law No. 11 of 2005 on the Ratification of the ICESCR; Government Regulation No. 6 of 2025; Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 2 of 2025; and Constitutional Court Decision No. 168/PUU-XXI/2023. The secondary legal materials consist of books, journal articles, and documents of international organisations (Rahayu, 2020).

The legal materials were collected through library research by inventorying and classifying the relevant provisions. They were analysed qualitatively through grammatical and systematic interpretation and then presented prescriptively. The framework of the obligations to respect, protect, and fulfil is used to examine the state's responsibility; the theory of preventive and repressive legal protection (Hadjon, 1987) is used to map the forms of protection; and the legal system theory, comprising legal substance, structure, and culture (Friedman, 1975), together with the factors affecting law enforcement (Rifa'i, 2023), is used to assess effectiveness.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The State's Constitutional Responsibility for Workers' Normative Rights after Termination

The 1945 Constitution positions the state not merely as a guardian of public order but also as the party responsible for welfare. The provisions on work, fair wages, and social security form part of the "economic constitution", which binds the state to actively realise them rather than merely refrain from violating them (Asshiddiqie, 2010). In the context of termination, this obligation is crucial because job loss simultaneously cuts off regular income, threatens the basic needs of the family, and increases the risk of poverty (Arsyad, 2025).

The scope of this responsibility can be mapped through the three layers of state obligations regarding the right to work (Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 2006). The obligation to respect prohibits the state from adopting policies that arbitrarily abolish workers' rights. The obligation to protect requires the state to prevent and sanction violations by third parties, in this case employers, including termination without valid grounds and the neglect of compensation. The obligation to fulfil requires the state to provide the institutions, services, and programmes that enable workers to actually enjoy their

rights, such as labour inspection, dispute settlement bodies, and social security. This framework shows that the state's responsibility does not end with the enactment of legislation. A norm guaranteeing severance pay is meaningless if it is not monitored, not enforced, and not accessible to workers (Suandika, 2020).

In terms of legal substance, the regulatory framework has undergone fundamental change. Constitutional Court Decision No. 168/PUU-XXI/2023 called for the labour provisions scattered across Law No. 13 of 2003 and the labour cluster of Law No. 6 of 2023 to be reorganised into a separate statute. This was followed by Law No. 27 of 2026, which consists of 23 chapters and 313 articles, was promulgated and entered into force on 28 October 2026, and revoked Law No. 13 of 2003 and parts of Law No. 6 of 2023. The Law requires its implementing regulations to be issued no later than one year after promulgation, while the implementing regulations of the previous law remain in force insofar as they do not conflict with it. In addition, claims registered with the Industrial Relations Court before the Law entered into force continue to be settled under the old provisions (Zaidan, Machfudz, Habibie, & Wulandari, 2026).

These transitional provisions have important consequences. During the transition period, the rights of dismissed workers will be determined by a combination of new norms and old implementing regulations, creating considerable potential for differing interpretations of the basis for calculating compensation. The state's responsibility in this phase is to ensure legal certainty: issuing clear implementing regulations on time, disseminating the changes to workers and employers, and ensuring that the transition period is not exploited to reduce workers' rights. The state's constitutional responsibility is thus comprehensive, encompassing norm-making, inspection, law enforcement, and the socio-economic recovery of workers (Kumanireng, 2026).

Forms of Legal Protection for Workers' Normative Rights after Termination

According to Hadjon (1987), legal protection may be preventive, aimed at preventing violations, or repressive, aimed at restoring rights after a violation has occurred. In the context of termination, both forms materialise in three layers of protection: substantive, procedural, and social.

Substantive protection concerns the economic rights arising from termination, namely severance pay, long-service pay, and compensation for entitlements, the amounts of which are determined by length of service and the grounds for termination, as well as wages, overtime pay, and allowances that had already accrued before the employment relationship ended. These rights are not an act of corporate generosity but a legal obligation, recognising the worker's contribution and serving as an economic cushion during the transition (Husni, 2014). Because they derive from statute, normative rights cannot be abolished by unilateral company policy. Termination carried out without fulfilling these rights may result in an order to pay the outstanding entitlements or even in the annulment of the termination by a dispute settlement body (Hasnati, Dewi, & Utama, 2025).

Procedural protection ensures that termination is not carried out arbitrarily. Workers are entitled to clear notification of the grounds for termination and an opportunity to reject it or lodge an objection. If a dispute arises, Law No. 2 of 2004 requires that it first be settled through bipartite negotiation for a maximum of 30 working days. If this fails, a termination dispute may proceed to mediation or conciliation, and if no agreement is reached, either party may file a claim with the Industrial Relations Court. This sequence combines preventive protection (dialogue and negotiation) with repressive protection (enforceable court judgments) and positions labour mediators as the embodiment of the state's presence when negotiations between the parties reach a deadlock (Hasan & Abadi, 2025).

Social protection is realised through the JKP programme within the national social security system. JKP provides cash benefits, access to labour market information, and job training so that dismissed workers can sustain themselves and return to the labour market (Wiryadi & Novendra, 2021). Government Regulation No. 6 of 2025 strengthens the programme: the cash benefit is set at 60% of wages for six months, the deadline for submitting claims is extended to six months after termination, and the JKP contribution is adjusted to 0.36% of wages. A provision of particular importance for worker protection is Article 39A, which guarantees that JKP benefits continue to be paid to workers in bankrupt or closed companies even where the employer is in arrears on contributions, without relieving the employer of the obligation to settle those arrears. The procedures for providing the benefits were subsequently adjusted through Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 2 of 2025.

Nevertheless, JKP must be understood as a complement to, not a substitute for, termination compensation. Termination compensation is an employer's obligation arising from the employment relationship, whereas JKP is a contribution-based social security scheme administered by BPJS Ketenagakerjaan (the Workers' Social Security Agency). Eligible workers are entitled to both simultaneously. The three layers of protection are inseparable: substantive rights without accessible procedures cannot be restored, while compensation without social protection is insufficient to secure the continuity of workers' lives (Nugroho, 2023).

The Effectiveness of Protection and the Problems of Its Enforcement

The effectiveness of post-termination protection is determined not only by the completeness of the norms but also by the institutional structure and legal culture that support them (Friedman, 1975). In terms of substance, the main current problem is the transition period of Law No. 27 of 2026. As long as its implementing regulations are incomplete, workers and employers face uncertainty about which norms apply, and this uncertainty tends to disadvantage the weaker party.

In terms of structure, labour inspection is the most decisive preventive instrument. Indonesia ratified ILO Convention No. 81 through Law No. 21 of 2003, which obliges the state to provide a sufficient number of inspectors with adequate facilities. However, various studies show that inspection has not been effective, mainly owing to the limited number of personnel, budget, and facilities relative to the vast territory and the large number of companies to be supervised (Fitriani et al., 2022). Dispute settlement mechanisms also face obstacles in the form of lengthy proceedings and the costs of transport and legal assistance, which are a heavy burden for workers who have just lost their income. Even when workers win in court, judgments are not always executed, particularly where the employer acts in bad faith or the company is bankrupt. These findings confirm that the ineffectiveness of post-termination protection stems more from the implementation of norms than from a legal vacuum, so that strengthened inspection and optimised mediation are required (Luntar, Pekuwali, & Dai, 2026).

In terms of legal culture, the formal equality of workers and employers before the law does not yet reflect substantive equality. Employers possess economic resources and access to professional legal counsel, while many workers do not understand the differences between severance pay, long-service pay, and compensation for entitlements and are therefore unable to assess whether the payment they receive complies with the law (Bonang & Lie, 2025). This condition weighs most heavily on workers in small companies or those without a trade union. The JKP programme faces similar constraints: workers' limited understanding, membership and administrative requirements, and dependence on employer compliance in registering workers and paying contributions (Siregar, Khairani, & Fatimah, 2025).

Based on this analysis, five strategic steps should be taken by the state. First, finalise the implementing regulations of Law No. 27 of 2026 before the one-year deadline, with clear and easily calculable norms on termination compensation. Second, strengthen labour inspection by increasing the number and competence of inspectors and by adopting risk-based inspection that prioritises companies conducting large-scale terminations. Third, expand access to justice through free legal consultation services, digital complaint channels accompanied by assistance, capacity building for mediators, and more effective mechanisms for executing judgments. Fourth, optimise JKP by simplifying requirements, integrating membership data, and linking it with vocational training and job placement services. Fifth, guarantee freedom of association and strengthen coordination among the Ministry of Manpower, regional manpower offices, BPJS Ketenagakerjaan, and the judiciary, so that compensation, social security, inspection, and dispute settlement do not operate in isolation. The measure of success is not the number of regulations enacted but the extent to which workers receive their rights on time, gain access to justice, and are able to restore their economic lives after termination (Zanzibar & Armanda, 2019).

4. CONCLUSION

The state's responsibility to guarantee workers' normative rights after termination derives from Article 27(2), Article 28D(2), Article 28H(3), and Article 34(2) of the 1945 Constitution, as well as from international obligations under the ICESCR. This responsibility encompasses the obligations to respect, protect, and fulfil; it therefore does not end with law-making but extends to inspection, law enforcement, dispute settlement, and social protection. The available legal protection operates on three layers: substantive (severance pay, long-service pay, compensation for entitlements, and outstanding wages), procedural (bipartite negotiation, mediation or conciliation, and the Industrial Relations Court), and social (JKP as strengthened by Government Regulation No. 6 of 2025), with JKP functioning as a complement to, rather than a substitute for, the employer's obligations.

The effectiveness of this protection is still hampered by uncertainty during the regulatory transition, limited inspection capacity, the high cost and length of dispute settlement and execution of judgments, and workers' low legal literacy and weak bargaining position. Law No. 27 of 2026 provides a momentum for reform, but it will be meaningful only if it is followed by timely implementing regulations, stronger inspection and access to justice, an optimised JKP, and solid institutional coordination. Further empirical research is needed to examine the implementation of the Law once its implementing regulations have been issued.

REFERENCES

Ahmadi, M. I., Muhibbin, M., & Utami, N. S. (2026). Perlindungan hukum terhadap hak buruh pasca pemutusan hubungan kerja yang berkeadilan [Just legal protection of workers' rights after termination of employment]. *Yustitiabelen, 12*(1).

Arsyad, R. R. (2025). Perlindungan hukum terhadap hak pekerja akibat pemutusan hubungan kerja (PHK) sepihak pada perusahaan alihdaya (outsourcing) di Dinas Tenaga Kerja, Koperasi, dan UKM Kota Gorontalo [Legal protection of workers' rights following unilateral termination in outsourcing companies at the Gorontalo City Office of Manpower, Cooperatives, and SMEs]. *Perspektif Administrasi Publik dan Hukum, 2*(1), 89–97. https://doi.org/10.62383/perspektif.v2i1.99

Asshiddiqie, J. (2010). *Konstitusi ekonomi* [The economic constitution]. Jakarta: Kompas.

Azhar, M., Silitonga, C. O., & Solechan. (2022). Prospek pemberian jaminan kehilangan pekerjaan guna memberikan perlindungan hak pekerja dalam sistem hukum ketenagakerjaan [Prospects of the job loss benefit for protecting workers' rights in the labour law system]. *Administrative Law &*

Governance Journal, 5(1), 39–55.

Bonang, R., & Lie, G. (2025). Perlindungan hukum terhadap pekerja dalam kasus pemutusan hubungan kerja (PHK) di Indonesia [Legal protection of workers in termination of employment cases in Indonesia]. *NUSANTARA: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial, 12*(10), 4273–4278.

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2006). *General Comment No. 18: The right to work (Article 6 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights)* (E/C.12/GC/18). Geneva: United Nations.

Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945 (*Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*).

Constitutional Court Decision No. 168/PUU-XXI/2023.

Fitriani, R. A., Satria, R., Astono, A., Sitorus, A. P. M. C., & Utomo, S. (2022). Efektivitas pengawasan ketenagakerjaan terhadap upah minimum pekerja [The effectiveness of labour inspection on workers' minimum wages]. *Jurnal USM Law Review, 5*(2), 809–818.

Friedman, L. M. (1975). *The legal system: A social science perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Government Regulation No. 6 of 2025 on Amendments to Government Regulation No. 37 of 2021 on the Implementation of the Job Loss Benefit Programme.

Hadjon, P. M. (1987). *Perlindungan hukum bagi rakyat di Indonesia* [Legal protection for the people in Indonesia]. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu.

Harahap, A. M., Ramadhan, K. I., Milen, S., Anshory, R., & Harahap, M. J. A. (2023). Perlindungan hukum bagi pekerja yang diberhentikan dengan tidak dibayar pesangonnya (Studi kasus Putusan No. 148/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2020/PN.Plg) [Legal protection for dismissed workers whose severance was not paid: A case study of Decision No. 148/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2020/PN.Plg]. *Yustisi: Jurnal Hukum dan Hukum Islam, 10*(2), 52–56.

Hasan, F., & Abadi, S. (2025). Perlindungan hukum terhadap hak pekerja kontrak dalam pemutusan hubungan kerja [Legal protection of contract workers' rights in termination of employment]. *Legal Standing: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, 9*(1), 64–76. https://doi.org/10.24269/ls.v9i1.11128

Hasnati, H., Dewi, S., & Utama, A. S. (2025). Pelaksanaan hak-hak tenaga kerja kontrak akibat pemutusan hubungan kerja (PHK) pada PT Asia Forestama Raya berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 tentang Ketenagakerjaan [Implementation of contract workers' rights following termination at PT Asia Forestama Raya under Law No. 13 of 2003 on Manpower]. *Science: Indonesian Journal of Science, 2*(1), 193–201. https://doi.org/10.31004/science.v2i1.319

Husni, L. (2014). *Pengantar hukum ketenagakerjaan Indonesia* [Introduction to Indonesian labour law] (Rev. ed.). Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.

Kamil, R., & Gunadi, A. (2025). Perlindungan hukum terhadap hak normatif pekerja PKWTT pasca PHK akibat perubahan kondisi usaha berdasarkan hukum positif Indonesia [Legal protection of the normative rights of permanent workers after termination due to changes in business conditions under Indonesian positive law]. *Riwayat: Educational Journal of History and Humanities, 8*(4), 8384–8394. https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v8i4.51141

Kumanireng, A. U. (2026). Implementasi perlindungan hak pekerja dalam hubungan kerja berdasarkan peraturan perundang-undangan ketenagakerjaan [Implementation of the protection of workers' rights in employment relations under labour legislation]. *Gloria Justitia, 6*(2), 497–535. https://doi.org/10.25170/gloriajustitia.v6i2.8112

Law No. 11 of 2005 on the Ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Law No. 2 of 2004 on Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement.

Law No. 21 of 2003 on the Ratification of ILO Convention No. 81 concerning Labour Inspection in Industry and Commerce.

Law No. 27 of 2026 on Labour Protection (*Undang-Undang tentang Pelindungan Ketenagakerjaan*).

Law No. 40 of 2004 on the National Social Security System.

Luntar, M. R. R., Pekuwali, U. L., & Dai, H. A. Y. (2026). Perlindungan hukum preventif dalam

menjamin hak-hak tenaga kerja menurut perjanjian kerja berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 tentang Ketenagakerjaan [Preventive legal protection in guaranteeing workers' rights under employment agreements based on Law No. 13 of 2003 on Manpower]. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Humaniora, 5*(3), 854–868. https://doi.org/10.55606/jurrish.v5i3.8637

Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian hukum* [Legal research] (Rev. ed.). Jakarta: Kencana.

Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 2 of 2025 on the Job Loss Benefit Programme.

Nugroho, C. A. (2023). Perlindungan hukum pada tenaga kerja yang mengalami pemutusan hubungan kerja (PHK) karena dampak pandemi Covid-19 [Legal protection for workers dismissed due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic]. *Hukum dan Dinamika Masyarakat, 21*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.56444/hdm.v21i1.3995

Rahayu, D. P. (2020). *Metode penelitian hukum* [Legal research methods]. Yogyakarta: Thafa Media.

Rifa'i, I. J. (2023). Ruang lingkup metode penelitian hukum [The scope of legal research methods]. In *Metodologi penelitian hukum* [Legal research methodology]. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?id=6OO8EAAAQBAJ

Siregar, R. E., Khairani, K., & Fatimah, T. (2025). Perlindungan hak tenaga kerja penyandang disabilitas dalam mendapatkan pekerjaan di Kota Padang [Protection of the rights of workers with disabilities in obtaining employment in Padang City]. *Lareh Law Review, 2*(2), 134–147. https://doi.org/10.25077/llr.2.2.135-148.2024

Suandika, I. N. (2020). Perlindungan hukum terhadap hak-hak karyawan tetap dalam hal terjadi pemutusan hubungan kerja (PHK) menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 [Legal protection of permanent employees' rights in the event of termination under Law No. 13 of 2003]. *Jurnal Ilmiah Raad Kertha, 2*(1), 43–51. https://doi.org/10.47532/jirk.v2i1.151

Wiryadi, K. J., & Novendra, B. (2021). Jaminan kehilangan pekerjaan dampak pandemi Covid-19: Pengaturan, manfaat, dan perbandingannya dengan negara lain [The job loss benefit amid the Covid-19 pandemic: Regulation, benefits, and comparison with other countries]. *Negara Hukum: Membangun Hukum untuk Keadilan dan Kesejahteraan, 12*(1), 23–41.

Zaidan, D., Machfudz, M. A. S., Habibie, M. Z., & Wulandari, W. (2026). Implementasi perlindungan hak normatif pekerja dalam perselisihan pemutusan hubungan kerja di Provinsi Bengkulu [Implementation of the protection of workers' normative rights in termination disputes in Bengkulu Province]. *ULIL ALBAB: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin, 5*(6), 1091–1098. https://doi.org/10.56799/jim.v5i6.16828

Zanzibar, Z., & Armanda, D. (2019). Pengawasan hak-hak tenaga kerja: Peran Dinas Penanaman Modal, Transmigrasi dan Tenaga Kerja [Supervision of workers' rights: The role of the Office of Investment, Transmigration and Manpower]. *HUMANIS: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara, 5*(1), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.52137/humanis.v6i1.03