

Original Article

Inclusive Legal Communication for the Protection of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities A Comparative Study of Sweden, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States

Ani Purwati¹✉, Gita Ruslita²

¹Master of Law Program, Graduate School, Universitas Sahid, Indonesia

²Communication Science, Graduate School, Universitas Sahid, Indonesia

Correspondence Author: ani_purwati@usahid.ac.id✉

Abstract:

The normative protection of the rights of persons with disabilities requires legal guarantees that go beyond formal recognition toward the realization of substantive rights. The legal orientation is directed toward ensuring accessibility to legal information, the provision of reasonable accommodation, and equal participation in public services. This normative framework is grounded in the principle of equality before the law and the prohibition of discrimination as affirmed in Article 28D paragraph (1) and Article 28I paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. It is further reinforced by Law Number 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities, particularly Article 24 concerning access to justice, as well as international commitments under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), especially Article 9 on accessibility and Article 21 on access to information. At the empirical level, however, legal protection practices continue to demonstrate a discrepancy between norms and the implementation of public services. Limited access to information, the administrative character of legal communication, and institutional power asymmetries hinders the effective fulfilment of rights. This situation is exacerbated by the weak operational regulation of Article 24 of Law Number 8 of 2016, which has not yet comprehensively formulated standards for accessible legal communication. This study employs a normative juridical method with a comparative legal approach by examining legal communication practices in Sweden, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States. The functional analysis indicates that the effectiveness of disability protection is largely determined by the integration of responsive legal norms with inclusive public communication systems. The study proposes a model of legal and communication reform that positions legal communication as a strategic instrument for rights protection through strengthening accessibility obligations, meaningful participation, and the reconstruction of power relations between the state and citizens with disabilities.

Keywords: inclusive legal communication; protection of the rights of persons with disabilities; information accessibility; human rights.

Submitted	: 10 February 2026
Revised	: 18 February 2026
Acceptance	: 11 March 2026
Publish Online	: 11 March 2026

*This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.
Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by Universitas Syiah Kuala*



Introduction

The protection of the rights of persons with disabilities occupies a strategic position in contemporary social justice discourse, as it directly intersects with the quality of citizenship, the accessibility of public services, and the fulfilments of human rights within a democratic state governed by the rule of law. Protection cannot be understood merely as the normative recognition of rights; rather, it must be translated into factual capacities that enable persons with disabilities to understand legal provisions, navigate service procedures, obtain appropriate accommodation, and participate meaningfully in decision-making processes that affect their lives. Within the national legal context, the principles of equality before the law and the prohibition of discrimination are affirmed in Article 28D paragraph (1) and Article 28I paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. These constitutional principles are further elaborated in Law Number 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities, particularly Article 24, which guarantees access to justice. At the international level, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities places accessibility and openness of information as legal obligations of States Parties, as stipulated in Articles 9 and 21 (United Nations, 2006). However, the existence of these normative instruments has not yet been fully transformed into effective protection in the practice of public service delivery.

A major challenge in Indonesia relates to the weak operationalization of legal norms, particularly in the dimension of legal communication. Public service delivery remains dominated by bureaucratic approaches that prioritize administrative compliance. Accessible communication needs such as the use of sign language, the provision of information in easy-to-read formats, the utilization of assistive technologies, alternative media, and communication support are often positioned as supplementary facilities rather than rights-based obligations. Evaluations of local government public services released by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform indicate that although efforts to strengthen services for vulnerable groups have been nationally mainstreamed, the quality of inclusive service implementation still demonstrates significant disparities across regions and service units (Ministry of PANRB, 2024). This condition suggests that the guarantee of access to justice under Law Number 8 of 2016 has not been accompanied by uniform technical standards for legal communication or adequate administrative enforcement mechanisms.

The gap between norms and practice is reflected in empirical findings on population data and access to services. The report *Portrait of Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia: Results of the 2020 Population Census Long Form*, published by Statistics Indonesia in December 2024, records that the number of persons with disabilities in Indonesia exceeds twenty million, with diverse socio-demographic characteristics. Structural barriers consistently emerge in the fields of education and employment ([BPS, 2024](#)). These findings are reinforced by a report from the United Nations Population Fund, which emphasizes a strong correlation between limited access to public services and the low quality of life experienced by persons with disabilities ([UNFPA, 2024](#)). In the education sector, the World Bank identifies that a portion of children with disabilities remain outside the formal education system, while those who are enrolled continue to face inadequate learning support and communication accessibility (World Bank, 2024). These facts indicate that disability issues are closely linked to the design of services based on information and communication systems.

The development of digital-based public services further increases the complexity of rights protection. While digitalization expands service reach, it simultaneously

generates new forms of exclusion when accessibility principles are not adopted as mandatory standards. National media coverage has revealed findings by the National Disability Commission regarding the low level of accessibility of public service websites for persons with visual impairments, partly due to the limited involvement of users with disabilities in digital interface design ([Tempo, 2024](#)). From a policy perspective, Open Government Indonesia in collaboration with the National Development Planning Agency has issued guidelines for inclusive public communication and information services for persons with disabilities, referring to international standards such as the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines and encouraging the implementation of periodic accessibility audits ([OGI-Bappenas, 2024](#)). The Ministry of Communication and Information Technology has also announced plans to strengthen digital public information transparency regulations that take disability needs into account ([Kominfo, 2024](#)). Nevertheless, the existence of policy guidelines has not fully closed the implementation gap due to weak enforcement instruments, limited bureaucratic capacity in accessibility issues, and inadequate effective complaint mechanisms.

From a legal theory perspective, this condition reflects the tension between *law in books* and *law in action*, where legal norms exist as formal texts but do not yet function as guarantees of access in the lived experiences of citizens. Responsive legal theory, as developed by Nonet and Selznick, conceptualizes law as a social instrument that must be oriented toward the achievement of substantive justice rather than mere normative certainty ([Nonet & Selznick, 1978](#)). From the standpoint of communication theory, this problem necessitates an institutional and participatory approach to legal communication, in which law operates through processes of meaning-making, procedural understanding, and service interaction. One-way communication designs tend to position the state as the dominant actor and persons with disabilities as passive recipients, thereby reinforcing unequal power relations. In the Indonesian context, this situation underscores the urgency of reform in two interrelated domains: operational legal reform and communication design reform. At the operational level, critical issues include the establishment of minimum standards for accessible communication in justice and public services, the implementation of continuous digital accessibility audits, the strengthening of responsive complaint mechanisms, and the affirmation of enforceable institutional obligations. In the communication domain, strategic agendas include the development of service co-design with disability communities, the provision of information formats that address diverse types of disabilities, the strengthening of feedback mechanisms, and the enhancement of the capacity of public service personnel.

A comparative legal approach offers significant methodological contributions in this context. Sweden classifies the failure to provide accessibility as a form of discrimination within its national disability policy, marking a shift toward legally enforceable obligations (Swedish Agency for Participation, 2023). Canada has developed the Accessible Canada Act, which incorporates audit systems, complaint handling, and enforcement by a dedicated authority (Government of [Canada, 2019](#)). The Netherlands demonstrates the dynamics of CRPD implementation in public governance and spaces, including challenges in translating international norms into national practice, as analysed in Scopus-indexed journals such as *Laws* (van den Berg et al., 2024). Germany has established accessibility frameworks through the Federal Disability Equality Act and digital accessibility regulations under the Barrier-Free Information Technology Ordinance, complemented by administrative dispute resolution mechanisms (Federal Government of [Germany, 2023](#)). The United States applies effective communication

standards under the Americans with Disabilities Act through operational guidelines on auxiliary aids and services for both public and private entities (U.S. Department of [Justice, 2023](#)).

This comparison demonstrates that the effectiveness of disability protection is not determined solely by the existence of legal norms, but by the capacity of the state to translate those norms into service communication systems that are accessible, monitored, and capable of providing remedies in cases of violation. This study positions inclusive legal communication as a strategic instrument in the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, focusing analytical attention on service communication design as the primary locus of rights implementation. Using a normative juridical method with a comparative legal approach, this research examines accessibility obligations, implementation mechanisms, and enforcement tools across five comparative jurisdictions and formulates a reform model for Indonesia that integrates accessible communication standards, meaningful participation, audit and oversight mechanisms, and the reconstruction of power relations between the state and citizens with disabilities in the delivery of public services.

Literature Review

Studies on the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities in academic literature can be classified into three main strands: the human rights–based approach, the public policy and social welfare approach, and the anti-discrimination approach. Within the human rights framework, disability is understood as an issue of substantive justice that positions the state as the primary actor responsible for ensuring equal access to rights and services. This perspective rejects the view of disability as merely an individual issue and emphasizes the structural responsibility of the state to create conditions that enable equal participation. The ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) is widely regarded as a critical turning point that shifted the disability paradigm from a medical model toward a rights-based approach, with a focus on accessibility, full participation, and the obligation to provide reasonable accommodation. Human rights literature consistently affirms that a state’s failure to provide access to legal information and public services that can be effectively used by persons with disabilities must be understood as a rights violation rather than merely a technical administrative issue or a matter of institutional capacity ([United Nations, 2006](#); [Quinn, 2012](#); [Lawson, 2020](#)).

In the context of national and comparative law, numerous studies conceptualize disability regulation as a corrective instrument to address systemic structural inequalities. Research examining practices in European and North American countries demonstrates that the effectiveness of disability protection is largely determined by the integration of legal norms, public sector policy design, and the existence of operational enforcement mechanisms. Canada, through the Accessible Canada Act, is frequently examined as an example of a legal regime explicitly oriented toward eliminating structural barriers through compliance obligations, audit systems, and rights-based complaint mechanisms. In the United States, literature on the Americans with Disabilities Act positions the concept of effective communication as a minimum normative standard binding both public and private entities in the provision of information and services. Meanwhile, studies on Germany and Sweden reveal an important paradigm shift in which accessibility is no longer treated as a voluntary social policy, but rather as an integral part of an anti-discrimination regime with legally

enforceable consequences ([Prince, 2020](#); [Bagnato's, 2019](#); [Waddington, 2018](#)). Alongside these developments, public policy and service governance studies highlight the persistent gap between regulatory formulation and implementation at the service delivery level.

Reports and studies published by the OECD and the World Bank indicate that even countries with relatively progressive disability regulatory frameworks continue to face significant challenges at the implementation stage, particularly in the context of information- and technology-based public services. Research on service accessibility emphasizes that effective access does not depend solely on the availability of physical infrastructure, but also on the quality of communication design, the clarity of administrative procedures, and users' capacity to understand and effectively utilize services. From this perspective, disability is positioned as a governance issue that requires cross-sectoral and cross-institutional reform, rather than fragmented sectoral interventions ([OECD, 2022](#); [World Bank, 2024](#)).

Recent literature published in Scopus-indexed journals increasingly links disability issues to the dynamics of public space, digital transformation, and citizen participation. Articles in journals such as *Laws* and *Disability & Society* demonstrate the ambivalent character of digital public service delivery. On the one hand, digitalization has the potential to expand service reach and accelerate access; on the other hand, it can generate new forms of exclusion when principles of universal design and inclusive communication are not integrated from the outset of service design. This body of literature argues that digital accessibility cannot be reduced to a purely technical matter, but must be understood as a normative issue related to the distribution of power, rights, and opportunities for participation in digital societies ([Goggin & Ellis, 2020](#); [van den Berg et al., 2024](#)).

Despite these advances, most existing studies continue to position communication as a supporting technical variable rather than as a legal instrument with an autonomous role in rights protection. Legal scholarship tends to focus on the analysis of norms, policies, and institutions, while communication studies more often emphasize representation, media, or literacy without directly linking these dimensions to rights protection mechanisms in public service practices. Available studies on legal communication generally address legal language, transparency, or access to justice in a broad sense, but have yet to systematically integrate disability perspectives as a primary analytical framework ([Mattila, 2016](#); [Halliday & Schmidt, 2017](#)). In the Indonesian context, research on disability remains largely dominated by normative analyses of Law Number 8 of 2016, studies on social welfare policy, and empirical research highlighting barriers in education and employment. Several studies indicate that the implementation of disability regulations faces recurring challenges, including weak inter-agency coordination, limited resources, and suboptimal oversight mechanisms.

The dimension of legal communication particularly how legal information and service procedures are designed, conveyed, and understood by persons with disabilities has not yet become a central focus of analysis. Consequently, the gap between *law in books* and *law in action* is more frequently explained as an issue of institutional compliance, without sufficiently unpacking the role of communication as a key mechanism in the realization of rights ([Suharto, 2021](#); [Mulyadi, 2022](#)). Based on this literature mapping, the research gap addressed by this study lies in the absence of analyses that explicitly position inclusive legal communication as a primary instrument in the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, particularly through a

comparative legal approach. Existing literature has not yet integrated the analysis of legal norms, service communication design, and enforcement mechanisms into a single, coherent conceptual framework. Furthermore, there is a lack of reform models that systematically link accessible communication standards with legal obligations and governance oversight within the Indonesian context. This study seeks to fill this gap by developing an inclusive legal communication framework grounded in a comparative analysis of practices in Sweden, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States.

The writing method uses the usual Georgia font 11 with single spaces. Describe in detail the data collection procedure starting from the sample or research subject used, the research design, to the analysis technique. The method section should be narrated in paragraph form containing clear sentences, but if the research procedures and analysis techniques are too long, they may be presented in the form of a flow chart ([RAzra & Ichan 2024:14](#)).

This section should not write down the theoretical basis except for the basis for confirmation or decision making. Furthermore, a reference may be written which is the basis for the modification of the research procedure or analysis technique used. Inclusion criteria of the studies to be included were: (a) studies assessing factors influencing acceptance and choice of therapy for cancer patients, for all types and stages of cancer; (b) qualitative research; (c) published within the last 10 years; (d) studies using single and multimodal therapy; and (e) studies on factors and access that influence actualization of cancer therapy ([Thomas, 2023:13](#)).

Methods

This study employs a normative juridical method, focusing on doctrinal and conceptual analysis of disability law and legal communication practices in the delivery of public services. The method is used to examine law as a living norm within statutory frameworks and international legal instruments, as well as to assess the extent to which these norms possess practical efficacy in ensuring the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, particularly with regard to information accessibility and access to justice. The normative approach is considered relevant because the object of this research is grounded in the construction of legal obligations of the state and public institutions in fulfilling disability rights substantively, rather than in measuring individual behaviour alone.

The research adopts a comparative legal approach. This approach aims to compare regulatory models and the implementation of accessibility obligations and legal communication across five jurisdictions: Sweden, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States. The selection of these countries is based on the representativeness and variation of disability protection regimes, ranging from accessibility-based anti-discrimination approaches and audit and legal compliance mechanisms to the regulation of effective communication standards in public services. The comparison is conducted functionally, with particular emphasis on how legal norms in each jurisdiction are translated into service communication design, implementation mechanisms, and enforcement instruments that are accessible to persons with disabilities. The legal materials used in this study are classified into primary, secondary, and tertiary legal sources. Primary legal materials include national legislation governing the rights of persons with disabilities, international legal instruments—particularly the Convention on

the Rights of Persons with Disabilities—and key regulations in the comparative jurisdictions related to accessibility and legal communication in public services. Secondary legal materials consist of legal textbooks, articles published in nationally accredited journals and Scopus-indexed international journals, reports from international organizations, and public policy documents relevant to disability issues, public service delivery, and accessibility governance. Tertiary legal materials are used in a limited manner to clarify terms, concepts, and analytical categories employed in the study.

The collection of legal materials is conducted through library research, involving a systematic review of statutes, academic literature, and relevant policy documents. The analysis of legal materials is carried out using qualitative normative analysis, combining conceptual and comparative approaches. The analysis is directed at identifying regulatory patterns, gaps between norms and practice, and the relationship between law and communication in the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. In this context, the analysis is also used to examine the tension between *law in books* and *law in action*, particularly in the dimensions of legal communication and service accessibility. The results of the normative and comparative analysis are subsequently used to formulate a model for inclusive legal communication reform that is contextualized for Indonesia. This model integrates accessible communication standards, enforceable institutional legal obligations, oversight mechanisms, and the principle of meaningful participation of persons with disabilities. Accordingly, this research method is intended not only to produce a normative mapping of disability protection, but also to offer an applicable conceptual framework for strengthening the effectiveness of the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities in the delivery of public services.

The presentation of the research results and their discussion must be written in a single unit, after which the data on the research results are discussed in depth with citations in relevant journal articles. The writing of this section uses the usual Georgia font letters in 11 fonts and single spacing in the form of aligned left and right and the beginning of the paragraph fits into 7 letters from the left margin. Simple research data is simply narrated in the form of complete and clear sentences, while complex data is presented in the form of tables and or pictures as needed. Making/designing a table follows the format as an example. The table is made with no vertical lines (column lines) as the format and examples be low).

Results

The results of the normative analysis and comparative legal study demonstrate that the effectiveness of protecting the rights of persons with disabilities is not determined solely by the existence of legal norms, but rather by the extent to which those norms regulate and operationalize communication within public service delivery. Across all jurisdictions examined, effective disability protection is characterized by the existence of communication standards that can be practically used by persons with disabilities, clear enforcement mechanisms, and the involvement of disability groups in the design and evaluation of services. These findings affirm that legal communication functions as a mediating mechanism between legal texts and the concrete experiences of citizens in accessing and exercising their rights. Without communication that is understandable and accessible, the recognition of rights risks remaining a normative construct lacking social efficacy ([Quinn, 2012](#); [Lawson, 2020](#)).

In the Indonesian context, the findings reveal a significant gap between

normative regulation and service implementation. Law Number 8 of 2016 has formally recognized the right to access justice and information accessibility for persons with disabilities; however, this recognition has not been supported by operational and binding legal communication standards. As a result, legal communication in public services remains dominated by one-way and uniform administrative approaches that fail to accommodate the diverse needs of persons with sensory, cognitive, and intellectual disabilities. This condition illustrates that rights protection in Indonesia tends to remain at the level of *law in books* and has not yet fully transformed into *law in action* that can be effectively utilized by persons with disabilities ([Suharto, 2021](#); [Mulyadi, 2022](#)).

Comparative analysis with practices in other countries reveals more structured and functionally effective models of disability-related legal communication. Sweden and the Netherlands adopt approaches that classify the failure to provide accessibility as a form of discrimination. In both jurisdictions, legal communication is not treated as an additional service or a voluntary policy measure, but as a legal obligation embedded in all public service activities. The principle of universal design is systematically integrated into regulatory frameworks and administrative practices, making accessible communication standards an inherent component of service governance. This model narrows the gap between norms and practice, as the fulfilment of accessibility requirements does not depend on institutional discretion but on legally enforceable obligations ([Waddington, 2018](#); [van den Berg et al., 2024](#)). In this context, legal communication functions as an instrument for redistributing power by strengthening the position of persons with disabilities as equal legal subjects. Canada presents a different yet complementary approach through the Accessible Canada Act regime. Disability protection is constructed by emphasizing the removal of systemic barriers through compliance obligations, audit mechanisms, and rights-based complaint channels. Legal communication is situated within a compliance framework subject to continuous oversight, ensuring that accessibility obligations do not remain merely declarative.

The analysis indicates that the presence of supervisory mechanisms and administrative sanctions enhances the practical effectiveness of legal norms and prevents accessibility from being reduced to symbolic policy commitments. The Canadian model underscores that inclusive legal communication can function effectively only when supported by consistent and institutionalized enforcement instruments ([Prince, 2020](#)). The German approach highlights the importance of technical standardization and dispute resolution mechanisms. Accessibility regulations are translated into detailed technical standards, particularly in digital services and public information provision, and are complemented by administrative dispute resolution pathways between citizens and public authorities. Comparative findings show that the availability of rights-remedy mechanisms strengthens the position of persons with disabilities as active legal subjects, as violations of accessibility obligations can be institutionally reviewed and corrected. This approach emphasizes that inclusive legal communication requires not only normative and technical standards, but also corrective mechanisms when those standards are not fulfilled (Federal Government of [Germany, 2023](#)).

The United States operationalizes disability protection through the concept of effective communication under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Communication is positioned as a core element of rights protection, with obligations to provide auxiliary

aids and services tailored to the context and needs of users. The effectiveness of legal communication is assessed based on its capacity to ensure actual understanding and use of rights, rather than merely the formal availability of information. However, the analysis also indicates that a heavy reliance on litigation mechanisms may generate access inequalities for persons with disabilities who have limited resources, making the effectiveness of protection highly dependent on individuals' capacity to access the legal system ([Bagenstos, 2019](#)). When situated within this comparative landscape, Indonesia remains at an early stage in the development of inclusive legal communication. Although legal norms are in place, they have not yet been translated into uniform communication standards, systematic audit mechanisms, or effective enforcement pathways. Legal communication continues to be understood primarily as a supporting administrative function rather than as an instrument of rights protection. From the perspective of responsive legal theory, this condition indicates that the law has not been fully oriented toward substantively responding to the needs of vulnerable groups. Meanwhile, from the standpoint of legal communication theory, the dominance of one-way communication reinforces unequal power relations between the state and citizens with disabilities, thereby hindering the practical realization of normatively recognized rights ([Nonet & Selznick, 1978](#); [Halliday & Schmidt, 2017](#)).

The synthesis of comparative findings suggests that the effectiveness of inclusive legal communication rests on three core elements: the existence of binding accessible communication standards in both physical and digital services; oversight and enforcement mechanisms that enable audits, complaints, and rights remedies; and the meaningful participation of persons with disabilities in the design and evaluation of services. These three elements have not yet been systematically integrated into the Indonesian legal framework. Therefore, disability law reform in Indonesia should be directed toward integrating legal norms with inclusive public communication design, so that legal communication functions as a strategic instrument for rights protection rather than merely as a channel for the dissemination of administrative information.

Conclusion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the effectiveness of protecting the rights of persons with disabilities is not determined solely by the existence of legal norms, but by the capacity of the legal system to translate those norms into accessible and usable public service communication practices. Rights protection acquires substantive meaning only when norms concerning accessibility and access to justice are operationalized through inclusive legal communication that is understandable and responsive to the diverse needs of persons with disabilities. In the absence of these conditions, the recognition of rights in statutory regulations risks becoming symbolic and losing its practical relevance in social reality ([United Nations, 2006](#); [Nonet & Selznick, 1978](#)).

The comparative legal analysis of Sweden, Canada, the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States reveals a convergent pattern in effective disability protection. These countries position accessible communication as a binding legal obligation rather than as an additional policy measure or an act of administrative benevolence. Accessible communication standards are systematically integrated into public service regulations, reinforced by audit and enforcement mechanisms, and complemented by rights-remedy instruments in cases of violation. The diversity of approaches ranging from anti-discrimination regimes and audit-based compliance systems to technical

standardization and the concept of effective communication—demonstrates that successful protection does not depend on a single normative model, but on the consistent translation of legal norms into accountable and enforceable service communication systems ([Bagnato's, 2019; Prince, 2020; Waddington, 2018](#)).

The Indonesian context, however, continues to exhibit a pronounced gap between normative regulation and implementation practice. Law Number 8 of 2016 has established a progressive legal foundation for the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities, yet it has not been followed by the formulation of operational legal communication standards, systematic oversight mechanisms, or effective enforcement pathways. Legal communication in public services remains positioned primarily as a one-way administrative function, thereby reinforcing asymmetric power relations between the state and citizens with disabilities. This condition explains why rights protection in Indonesia remains largely situated at the level of *law in books* and has not yet been fully realized as *law in action* that can be meaningfully accessed and utilized by persons with disabilities ([Suharto, 2021; Mulyadi, 2022](#)). Based on these findings, this study concludes that the agenda for reforming the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities in Indonesia should be directed toward strengthening inclusive legal communication as a strategic instrument of rights protection. Such reform should encompass the integration of accessible communication standards across all public services, the reinforcement of oversight and rights-remedy mechanisms, and the meaningful involvement of persons with disabilities in the design and evaluation of services. Through this approach, legal communication is no longer understood merely as a means of conveying administrative information, but as a constitutive mechanism that enables persons with disabilities to exercise their rights on an equal basis within a democratic state governed by the rule of law and committed to justice ([United Nations, 2006; Nonet & Selznick, 1978](#)).

Suggestion

The suggestion contains a few simple sentences that answer the problem formulation or research objective presented in the beginning. The form of the sentence is not permitted to contain theories or formulas or statistical symbols. The writing systematics is aligned left-right and only the first line is indented into 7 letters using the usual Georgia font letter 11. No need to write suggestions or recommendations ([Thomas, 2024:13](#)).

References

- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2024). *Potret penyandang disabilitas di Indonesia: Hasil long form sensus penduduk 2020*. BPS RI.
- Bagenstos, S. R. (2019). *Law and the contradictions of the disability rights movement*. Yale University Press.
- Federal Government of Germany. (2023). *Federal Disability Equality Act (Behindertengleichstellungsgesetz) and Barrier-Free Information Technology Ordinance (BITV)*. German Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.
- Goggin, G., & Ellis, K. (2020). Disability, communication, and life itself in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Health Sociology Review*, 29(2), 168–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14461242.2020.1784020>
- Government of Canada. (2019). *Accessible Canada Act: An act to ensure a barrier-free Canada*. Government of Canada.
- Halliday, S., & Schmidt, P. (2017). *Conducting law and society research: Reflections on methods and practices*. Cambridge University Press.

- Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi. (2024). *Evaluasi pelayanan publik ramah kelompok rentan*. KemenPANRB RI.
- Komisi Nasional Disabilitas. (2024). *Laporan pemantauan aksesibilitas layanan publik digital*. KND RI.
- Lawson, A. (2020). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and European disability law: A catalyst for cohesion? *European Law Journal*, 26(3–4), 159–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12346>
- Mattila, H. (2016). *Comparative legal linguistics: Language of law, Latin and modern lingua francas*. Routledge.
- Mulyadi. (2022). Implementasi Undang-Undang Penyandang Disabilitas dalam pelayanan publik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan*, 52(2), 345–366.
- Nonet, P., & Selznick, P. (1978). *Law and society in transition: Toward responsive law*. Harper & Row.
- OECD. (2022). *Disability, work and inclusion: Mainstreaming disability in public policy*. OECD Publishing.
- Open Government Indonesia, & Bappenas. (2024). *Pedoman layanan komunikasi dan informasi publik yang inklusif bagi penyandang disabilitas*. OGI–Bappenas.
- Prince, M. J. (2020). Inclusive public policy: Disability and the Accessible Canada Act. *Canadian Public Administration*, 63(4), 531–549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12392>
- Quinn, G. (2012). Resisting the “temptation of elegance”: Can the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities socialise states to right behaviour? In O. Arnardóttir & G. Quinn (Eds.), *The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (pp. 215–256). Martinus Nijhoff.
- Suharto, E. (2021). Kebijakan sosial dan perlindungan penyandang disabilitas di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 25(1), 1–15.
- Swedish Agency for Participation. (2023). *Accessibility as non-discrimination: National disability policy framework*. Government of Sweden.
- Tempo. (2024). Aksesibilitas situs layanan publik masih rendah bagi disabilitas netra. *Tempo.co*. <https://www.tempo.co>
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. United Nations.
- United Nations Population Fund. (2024). *Disability inclusion and population development in Indonesia*. UNFPA Indonesia.
- van den Berg, E., Dijkstra, M., & Waddington, L. (2024). Implementing the CRPD in public spaces: Accessibility and participation in the Netherlands. *Laws*, 13(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws13010001>
- Waddington, L. (2018). Exploring vulnerability and the protection of persons with disabilities under EU law. *European Law Journal*, 24(1), 57–74.
- World Bank. (2024). *Disability inclusion in education: Challenges and opportunities in Indonesia*. World Bank Group.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2023). *Americans with Disabilities Act: Effective communication requirements*. DOJ Civil Rights Division.