

Integration of Language, Law, and Management in Organizational Governance: A Literature Review on Language Policy, Clarity of Legal Communication, and Management of Linguistic Diversity

Martolop Sinambela^{1*}, Heddy², Lia Hartika³, Jonni Hamonangan Silaen⁴, Darmawati⁵

Politeknik Negeri Medan

Corresponding Author: Martolop Sinambela; martolop.sinambela63@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Language Policy, Legal Communication, Organizational Governance.

Received : 02 August

Revised : 20 September

Accepted : 25 October

©2026 Sinambela. Heddy, Hartika, Silaen, Darmawati (s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

Language policy, legal communication, and organizational governance are interrelated fields, yet their discussions in the selected literature are scattered across different contexts and levels of analysis. This study aims to analyze the relationship between these three fields and develop an integrative conceptual framework for organizational governance. The study employed a qualitative approach with an integrative literature review design, analyzing eleven journal articles published between 2021 and 2025, purposively selected based on conceptual relevance. Data were analyzed through thematic synthesis using deductive and inductive coding, cross-article comparisons, and the formulation of interconceptual relationships. The synthesis identified four complementary dimensions: regulatory clarity, communication understandability, language access, and implementation capacity. Governance issues relate not only to the language accuracy of documents but also to clarity of responsibilities, user needs, resource support, and implementation evaluation. This study proposes a framework linking these four dimensions as a basis for examining organizational policy and communication. Practical implications include integrated document review, provision of language support as needed, and evaluation that takes user understanding into account. The resulting framework is conceptual in nature and does not yet prove causal relationships due to limited corpus and uneven access to source content. Empirical testing is needed to assess its applicability across different institutional contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Organizations operating in multilingual environments face the need to convey information clearly, formulate understandable rules, and manage communication among stakeholders with diverse backgrounds. In this context, language not only serves as a means of information exchange but also plays a role in regulating access to knowledge, decision-making processes, and the implementation of organizational policies. Research by Zhang, Ke, and Liu (2022) shows that the language choice of international organizations is related to their institutional characteristics, location, history, field of activity, and membership structure. Meanwhile, White (2022) explains that managing corporate language diversity is a complex issue that cannot be resolved through a single, universally applicable practice. Therefore, the relationship between language, law, and management needs to be examined with attention to the organizational context.

Language policy is a meeting point between communication needs, institutional arrangements, and managerial decisions regarding resource use. Zhang, Zhao, and Huang (2023) demonstrate that language regulation in constitutional texts is related to constitutional principles and the country's linguistic environment, including the placement of language provisions in sections on citizens' rights and obligations. From a management perspective, Wang Lifei (2022) develops a framework encompassing language planning, language education, corporate language, language resources, language standardization, and language in emergencies. The intersection of these two perspectives provides a basis for understanding that language policy needs to be analyzed through the alignment between normative formulations, user needs, and the organization's ability to implement them.

In the legal field, language quality is a crucial issue because written regulations must communicate actions, authorities, requirements, and consequences clearly enough to stakeholders. Hendrastuti and colleagues (2024), through a study of ten articles of the 2020 Job Creation Law, found linguistic issues in spelling, word choice, and sentence structure, despite informant assessments indicating a relatively high level of acceptability. These findings demonstrate that the acceptability of a text by a group of assessors does not necessarily mean that all linguistic elements are free from problems of accuracy, clarity, and coherence. In the context of organizational governance, this issue highlights the need to link the examination of document language with the examination of the substance of the rules, so that communication simplification still maintains the accuracy of normative meaning.

In addition to clarity of sentence structure, the formulation of exceptions in policies can influence the relationship between formal obligations and their implementation. Montle and Kekana (2024) found that clauses such as "whenever reasonably practicable" in the language policies of several South African institutions created room for evasion, while the absence of provisions regarding non-compliance also weakened implementation. From a policy management perspective, Cele (2021) highlighted the weak monitoring and resource support in the implementation of language policies in higher education in South Africa. Both studies indicate that implementation analysis needs to simultaneously

consider the interpretative space within the text, clarity of responsibilities, resource availability, and organizational oversight mechanisms.

Managing linguistic diversity also relates to users' ability to access services and understand information that determines their interests. Wang Wanhong (2022), in a study of health care translation policy in Ontario, demonstrated a tension between recognition of equal access for immigrants and budgetary considerations and institutional attitudes toward translation provision. The study revealed that recognition of language needs has not always been accompanied by adequate planning and service provision at the regional or institutional levels. Based on these issues, the integration of language, law, and management requires considering how a commitment to equal access translates into operational decisions regarding language services, funding, and accountability for their implementation.

In the higher education sector, language policy reconciles the demands of internationalization, the development of professional competencies, and the importance of maintaining national languages. Zuaro, Soler, and Björkman-Nylén (2022) found that policy documents of several Italian universities position English as a key element of internationalization, while demonstrating a commitment to multilingualism and the promotion of the Italian language. In the Indonesian context, Susanti and Putri (2025) identified a gap between regulatory recognition of the use of English in legal communication and its implementation in the legal education curriculum. Both studies demonstrate the need for alignment between the direction of language policy, curriculum management, faculty development, and the professional communication needs that institutions aim to meet.

The relationship between language and law can also be explored through communication management aimed at broadening public understanding of legal issues. Muhtadi, Yusanto, and Nesia (2024) demonstrated that legal information provided by the Banten High Prosecutor's Office Public Relations involves fact-finding, planning, communication implementation, and evaluation, taking into account the characteristics of the target audience. However, when compared across the corpus of eleven articles reviewed, discussions on legal text clarity, linguistic rights and access, and communication management capacity are still scattered across different contexts and analytical focuses. The gap highlighted in this article lies in the need to synthesize the relationships between these dimensions into a cross-disciplinary analytical framework, without assuming that findings from one sector or country can be directly applied to all organizations.

Based on these gaps, this article aims to analyze the integration of language, law, and management in organizational governance. The analysis aims to explain the relationship between language policy, clarity of legal communication, and management of linguistic diversity, and to identify organizational conditions that support or limit their implementation. The proposed conceptual contribution is an integrative framework that brings together the accuracy of rule formulation, information understandability, linguistic access, and implementation capacity as dimensions that need to be

examined together. Practically, this framework is expected to serve as a basis for developing evaluations of organizational policies and communication, while also providing a direction for empirical research to examine the relationships between these dimensions in different institutional contexts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Language in Organizational Governance

Language is a means of constructing and conveying meaning, enabling organizational members to understand goals, allocate responsibilities, and coordinate actions. In organizational governance, language is present through regulations, decisions, work procedures, contracts, reports, and service communications. Therefore, the quality of language use requires attention not only to grammatical accuracy, but also to its ability to clarify who is responsible, what actions should be taken, and the conditions that limit a decision.

Zhang, Ke, and Liu (2022) show that the language choice of international organizations is related to the organization's internal and external characteristics, including the type of organization, headquarters location, history, field of activity, and membership structure. These findings position language use as an institutional decision influenced by the organization's needs and environment. Therefore, the language used in an organization cannot always be explained solely by the individual abilities of its members, but also by the goals and relationships the organization seeks to build.

In this article, language is positioned as a link between policy formulation and organizational action. A provision can be applied differently if its terms, authority limits, or procedures are not uniformly understood. Therefore, language analysis in governance requires attention to information understandability, terminology consistency, accuracy of meaning, and the appropriateness of communication to user needs.

Language Policy and Institutional Arrangements

Language policy concerns the regulation of language use within specific social and institutional settings. Zhang, Zhao, and Huang (2023) explain that language policy encompasses language practices, language ideology, and language management. Language practices relate to the use of language in everyday activities, language ideology reflects views on the status and value of language, while language management encompasses efforts to direct its use. These three elements allow language policy to be analyzed as a relationship between formal provisions, institutional beliefs, and actual practices.

At the state level, language regulations can gain formal standing through constitutional texts. A study by Zhang, Zhao, and Huang (2023) shows that the placement of language policies in the constitution is related to constitutional principles and the state's linguistic environment. At the organizational level, this perspective helps explain that language regulations need to be read in conjunction with the institution's goals, user characteristics, and the surrounding normative environment. However, the status of internal organizational policies cannot be equated with that of constitutional provisions.

Analytically, an organization's language policy can be examined through four basic questions: what language is used, for what activities it is used, who is responsible for its implementation, and how user needs are accommodated. These questions help distinguish policies that merely state general orientations from those that provide operational direction.

Legal Language and Clarity of Legal Communication

Legal language is used to express norms, rights, obligations, authorities, prohibitions, and consequences in a legal context. Accuracy of meaning is crucial because changes in terms or relationships between sentences can affect the interpretation of a provision. However, the need for accuracy does not negate the need for understandability. Legal communication should enable stakeholders to understand the substance of the provision without obscuring the boundaries and requirements of its application.

Hendrastuti and colleagues (2024) examined the linguistic acceptability of ten articles of the 2020 Job Creation Law using a structural approach. The study identified issues with spelling, word choice, and sentence structure, including accuracy, clarity, and coherence. Although informant assessments indicated relatively high acceptability, the presence of linguistic issues suggests that reader acceptance and accuracy are aspects that require separate examination. These findings are relevant for developing organizational document audits that address both language quality and the meaning of their provisions.

In this article, the clarity of legal communication is distinguished between linguistic clarity and operational clarity. Linguistic clarity encompasses sentence regularity, terminological consistency, and the meaningful relationships between provisions. Operational clarity relates to a document's ability to explain the implementer, actions, requirements, deadlines, and procedures to be followed. This distinction is an analytical tool proposed in this study, not a standard measure that has been empirically tested.

Understandability also needs to be distinguished from legal validity. A document that is easy to read does not automatically imply proper authority or substance, while a document that meets formal requirements may not be easily understood by all users. Therefore, language examination should be considered a complement to examinations of substance and authority, not a substitute for them.

Policy Clause and Implementation of Obligations

Policy formulations can contain discretionary space to address differing implementation conditions. However, this space requires sufficiently clear boundaries to allow users to distinguish between justifiable adjustments and negligence. Montle and Kekana's (2024) study of the language policies of several institutions in South Africa showed that exception clauses can be a means of weakening policy implementation. The study also identified the role of the absence of provisions regarding non-compliance in implementation issues.

Based on these findings, the relationship between language and compliance cannot be sufficiently analyzed solely through the presence of words

denoting obligations. The examination also needs to focus on the requirements for exceptions, the parties authorized to grant approval, and the documented reasons.

Language Management and Implementation Capacity

Language management encompasses planned efforts to regulate language use and development according to institutional needs. Lifei (2022) developed a framework encompassing language planning, language education, corporate language, language resources, language standardization, and language in emergencies. This scope demonstrates that language management involves several interrelated functions. Organizational language use can therefore be analyzed alongside the management of competencies, information, procedures, and resources.

Implementation capacity is an organization's ability to translate policies into actionable and evaluable activities. Cele (2021) highlighted the weak monitoring and resource support in the implementation of language policies in higher education in South Africa. The study revealed the limitations of policies that have inclusive goals but are not supported by adequate implementation management. Therefore, language management analysis needs to go beyond formal documents to examine budgetary support, accountability, and monitoring.

In this study, implementation capacity is described through needs planning, division of responsibilities, provision of competencies and resources, and implementation evaluation. These four aspects are used as categories to understand the relationship between organizational policies and practices. These categories are not intended as quantitative indices, but rather as a basis for grouping and comparing literature findings.

Linguistic Diversity and Equality of Access

Linguistic diversity refers to the existence of differences in language and language proficiency among an organization's members and its service users. These differences create the need to determine how information is conveyed and communication support provided. White (2022) explains that organizations operating across borders face challenges in managing access to information produced and distributed in multiple languages. This complexity suggests that selecting a single working language may not necessarily solve all organizational communication problems.

Wanhong (2022) shows that Ontario's healthcare translation policy is influenced by the interplay between immigrant access needs, institutional perspectives, and budgetary considerations. Recognition of the importance of translation has not always been accompanied by adequate planning and service provision. These findings suggest that language access depends on operational decisions, as well as normative commitments to equity.

For the purposes of this research, equal access to language is understood as a concern for users' ability to obtain, understand, and use information relevant to their interests. This approach does not assume that every document must be available in all languages. Language support needs should be analyzed based on

user characteristics, information complexity, and the consequences of misunderstanding. Determining the form of support is a governance issue that requires a traceable rationale, resources, and evaluation.

Language Competence and Communication Management

Professional language competence relates to the ability to use language to complete tasks in a specific field. Susanti and Putri (2025) identified a gap between regulatory recognition of English in legal communication and its implementation in the legal education curriculum in Indonesia. The study linked competency development to curriculum design, faculty development, and institutional policies. Thus, professional communication skills need to be understood as an outcome that also requires organizational support.

At the higher education policy level, Zuaro, Soler, and Björkman-Nylén (2022) show that Italian universities manage the tension between the use of English for internationalization and a commitment to multilingualism and Italian. Meanwhile, Muhtadi, Yusanto, and Nesia (2024) show that legal information at the Banten High Prosecutor's Office involves fact-finding, planning, communication, and evaluation. Both contexts emphasize the relevance of managing communication goals, objectives, and implementation, despite the differences in their objectives and institutional interests. In this article, communication management serves as the bridge between information preparation and its delivery to users.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Approach and Design

This study uses a qualitative approach with an integrative literature review design to discuss the relationship between language, law, and management in organizational governance. This approach is used to bring together findings from different contexts and fields, identify relationships between concepts, and develop an analytical framework. Snyder (2019) explains that a literature review can be a research method for synthesizing fragmented knowledge and generating conceptual development. In this study, the synthesis focuses on the relationship between language policy, clarity of legal communication, linguistic access, and organizational implementation capacity.

The research design is exploratory and conceptual, as it does not utilize field data collection or statistical testing. The primary research materials are eleven journal articles published between 2021 and 2025, selected based on their relevance to the research theme. These articles are treated as a limited corpus for developing cross-disciplinary arguments, not as a representation of all publications on language, law, and management. Therefore, this research is not categorized as a systematic review claiming comprehensive search coverage.

Data Sources and Units of Analysis

The research data sources are secondary scientific publications consisting of eleven journal articles as the core corpus. The articles cover the contexts of international organizations, companies, universities, healthcare, legal

institutional communication, and language regulation in constitutions. The diversity of contexts is used to identify conceptual relationships, while maintaining the differences in the objectives, scale, and institutional environment of each study.

The materials reviewed included bibliographic identification, abstracts, and sections of the article's contents available through journal websites, publishers, or academic repositories. Access to source content was uneven, so discussion of each article was limited to verifiable information. Sources available only through abstracts were used to map the explicitly stated focus and findings, not to assess the details of methods or findings that were not readily available. The research units of analysis are conceptual statements and findings relevant to the relationship between language, law, and management. The article serves as the source unit, while the concepts, issues, and relationships reported serve as the coding units. This separation allows a single article to contribute to more than one theme without being treated as multiple separate studies.

Data Collection and Extraction Techniques

Data collection used documentation techniques by reviewing information available in published sources. Relevant information was organized into an extraction matrix so that each article could be compared based on common elements. The matrix separates the information reported by the sources from the interpretations developed in this study.

Extraction prioritizes paraphrasing that preserves the meaning of the source. If information is missing, it is marked as unavailable and not supplemented through conjecture. The identities of two authors surnamed Wang and two groups of authors surnamed Zhang are distinguished in the recording to avoid confusion over the attribution of findings.

Data analysis

The analysis used thematic synthesis, combining deductive and inductive coding. Deductive coding used the four initial dimensions from the literature review: clarity of organization, comprehensibility of communication, linguistic accessibility, and implementation capacity. Inductive coding allowed for additional issues identified in the sources, such as exclusion clauses, tensions between internationalization and national languages, and translation budget considerations. Initial categories were treated as analytical tools that could be refined, not as conclusions that must be justified by the entire article.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Study Results

An analysis of eleven articles shows that the relationship between language, law, and management can be understood through the shared issue of how policies are formulated, communicated, accessed, and implemented. Although the articles examined differ in context, each sheds light on the elements that determine the relationship between formal provisions and institutional practices. Some articles emphasize the quality of language formulation, while others focus on language policy, communication management, and resource

provision. The synthesis in this chapter brings these elements together without equating all organizations.

The study results are presented as a conceptual synthesis of verifiable source information. The term "results" in this discussion refers to the relationship patterns developed through literature comparison, not the results of field measurements or statistical testing. Therefore, the interdimensional relationships described are analytical explanations that still require empirical testing. This distinction is important to prevent conceptual contributions from being interpreted as proof of causality.

Language Policy as Part of Organizational Governance

The relationship between formal arrangements and institutional needs

Zhang, Zhao, and Huang (2023) show that language policy in constitutional texts is related to constitutional principles and the linguistic environment of the country. Meanwhile, Zhang, Ke, and Liu (2022) link the language choice of international organizations to the organization's characteristics, location, history, field of activity, and membership. Combined, these two studies demonstrate the importance of interpreting language policy through both its regulatory framework and the context in which it is used. However, regulations at the state level and internal organizational decisions remain distinct in their status and scope.

The analytical implication is that an organization's language policy needs to have a clearly defined purpose. Establishing a working language, for example, might be aimed at internal coordination, service delivery, or partner relations. Different purposes require different user considerations and implementation support. A policy that simply states the languages used does not adequately explain how these needs will be met.

Within the framework of this research, the adequacy of the arrangements is examined through the relationship between objectives, scope of activities, users, and implementation responsibilities. Clear arrangements need to differentiate between internal communications, documents governing actions, and information for service users. This distinction allows the organization to determine the appropriate level of rigor, form of assistance, and audit procedures. This means that decisions about language need to be linked to the function of the documents and the consequences of their use.

Written policies and actual practices

The existence of a written policy does not necessarily indicate that communication practices have followed that policy. For analytical purposes, a policy can be understood as a statement of direction, while implementation is a series of actions that require implementers and resources. The relationship between the two needs to be explored through evidence of activity, not simply through the wording of the document. This approach avoids evaluations that stop at administrative audits.

As an analytical example, an organization may establish the provision of information in two languages, but not yet determine who will translate and who

will check for equivalence. In such a situation, a formal commitment does not yet provide complete operational procedures. The primary issue is not merely language choice, but rather the division of tasks and quality control. This example illustrates the research framework, not field findings from a specific organization.

Clarity of Legal Language and Consistency of Interpretation ***Structural accuracy and understandability***

Hendrastuti and colleagues (2024) found issues with spelling, word choice, and sentence structure in the legal texts they studied, despite informants' assessments indicating relatively high levels of acceptability. These findings provide a rationale for distinguishing the acceptability of a text from the accuracy of its linguistic elements. In this synthesis, the two are treated as complementary dimensions of examination. Texts deemed acceptable still require examination of terminology, inter-sentence relationships, and clarity of provisions.

Discussions on the clarity of legal language should avoid equating short sentences with sound rules. Shorter sentences may facilitate readability, but omitting certain terms or limitations can alter the substance. Conversely, substantive accuracy does not have to be achieved through a structure that is difficult to follow. The examination proposed in this study combines accuracy of meaning with orderly presentation of information.

Clarity also depends on who uses the document. Certain terms may be understood by the author but require explanation by the service user. Therefore, understandability cannot be judged solely on the experience of expert readers. Organizations may consider checking with target users to determine whether they are able to re-explain the intended actions, terms, and procedures.

Exclusion and liability clauses

Montle and Kekana (2024) identified issues with exception clauses in the language policies of several institutions in South Africa. These findings suggest that the formulation of these exemptions may be associated with weak policy implementation. In this study, these findings are not used to conclude that all exceptions should be removed. The question that needs to be examined is whether the rationale, authority, and limits of the exceptions can be traced.

Discretion is necessary when implementation conditions are not fully predictable. However, discretion without explanatory procedures can complicate the evaluation of implementer decisions. This study therefore proposes a distinction between flexibility, which includes accountability mechanisms, and leeway, which lacks operational boundaries. This distinction is the result of conceptual development of issues identified in the literature.

Linguistic Diversity and Access to Information ***Language selection and user needs***

White (2022) explains the complexities of managing information in multilingual organizations and emphasizes the limitations of practices considered universal. This perspective strengthens the case for assessing language policies based on organizational context. Language standardization can

be considered for coordination purposes, but analysis should also examine groups requiring additional support. Thus, standardization and accommodation of diversity should be discussed as decisions with distinct goals and consequences.

This study suggests that language support needs be assessed based on user characteristics and the consequences of misunderstandings. Information about rights, obligations, or important procedures requires different attention than general information. The form of support doesn't always have to be the same; it can include explanations of terms, summaries, staff assistance, or translations. The choice should be based on the problem being addressed.

Translation as a service management decision

Wanhong (2022) highlights the tension between the need for linguistic access in Ontario healthcare, institutional attitudes, and budgetary considerations. These findings suggest that recognizing user needs does not always result in adequate service delivery. In this synthesis, translation is understood as an activity that requires decisions about priorities, funding, and quality control. The issue therefore goes beyond simply translating words from one language to another.

The conceptual implication is the need to link access to the ability to use information. Having a document in a language is insufficient if users still don't understand the procedures. Similarly, a readable translation must preserve the meaning of the original information. The access evaluation proposed in this study therefore encompasses availability, understandability, and the opportunity to obtain clarification.

Organizational Capacity in Implementing Language Policy

Cele (2021) highlights the limitations of monitoring and resources in the implementation of language policy in higher education in South Africa. Wang Lifei (2022) provides a language management framework that encompasses several management areas, including planning, education, resources, and standardization. The intersection of these two perspectives helps explain that implementation requires the coordination of multiple organizational functions. Language policy cannot simply be treated as a document editing exercise.

Within the framework of this research, implementation capacity encompasses the division of responsibilities, implementer competence, resource availability, and evaluation. These elements are complementary. Implementers with language skills still require authority and time to complete tasks, while budgets require a clear utilization plan. Therefore, implementation barriers need to be explored within specific work processes.

This discussion also distinguishes available resources from resources that meet needs. An organization may have employees who are proficient in a particular language but lack the ability to review legal terms or effectively communicate procedures. Competency needs should be identified based on the type of work. Separation of the roles of substance preparer, language reviewer, and service manager can be considered based on the organization's capacity.

Implementation evaluation should not rely solely on the number of documents or activities. These output measures can be combined with assessments of user understanding, the types of recurring questions, and the accuracy of communication problem resolution. These suggestions represent managerial implications of the research framework, not indicators that have been proven applicable across all sectors. Organizations need to tailor their measurements to the objectives and characteristics of the service.

Professional Competence and Legal Communication Management

Susanti and Putri (2025) identified a gap between the regulatory recognition of English in legal communication and its integration into legal education in Indonesia. This study demonstrates the relevance of curriculum management and faculty development to support professional competence. Meanwhile, Zuaro, Soler, and Björkman-Nylén (2022) demonstrate how Italian university policy reconciles internationalization with multilingualism and national languages. Both studies provide context for discussing the alignment between policy orientation and the development of implementing capacity.

In this discussion, professional competency is understood based on the work to be performed, not just general language proficiency. The ability to draft documents, check terminology for consistency, explain procedures, and respond to user inquiries are distinct requirements. Therefore, competency development programs need to define clear task objectives. This alignment helps link training activities to organizational needs.

Muhtadi, Yusanto, and Nesia (2024) showed that legal information at the Banten High Prosecutor's Office involves fact-finding, planning, communication, and evaluation. These findings demonstrate the relevance of target management and the implementation of legal communication activities. However, the presence of a series of activities does not in itself demonstrate changes in recipient compliance or behavior. Assessing these outcomes requires additional evidence that aligns with the evaluation objectives.

This research synthesis distinguishes between message delivery, message comprehension, and information utilization in action. These three are distinct evaluation targets. Information delivered may not necessarily be understood, while understanding may not necessarily result in appropriate action if other obstacles are present. Therefore, communication management needs to determine the outcomes to be assessed before selecting success indicators.

Synthesis of the Legal and Management Language Integration Framework Interdimensional relationships

Based on the previous discussion, this study develops a framework that integrates regulatory clarity, communication understandability, linguistic access, and implementation capacity. Regulatory clarity explains the substance of the action, while communication understandability relates to the user's ability to grasp its meaning. Linguistic access addresses the availability of support for obtaining and using information. Implementation capacity provides the implementers and processes that enable the provisions to be implemented.

This relationship is not positioned as a linear sequence. User feedback, for example, may indicate that provisions need to be refined, not simply re-clarified. Similarly, implementation difficulties may indicate that obligations were formulated without considering organizational capacity. Thus, this framework incorporates the need for feedback between policy development and implementation.

The framework demonstrates that improvements in one dimension do not necessarily address weaknesses in others. Document simplification does not replace the need for translation for users unfamiliar with the document's language. Nor does increasing budgets resolve unclear responsibilities if the division of tasks has not been established. Therefore, the proposed unit of analysis is the interdimensional alignment within an organizational process.

Conditions that limit the application

The implementation of the framework requires consideration of the type of organization, user characteristics, level of language diversity, and the consequences of communication errors. Services that define user rights require different vetting procedures than routine internal communications. Organizations with cross-border networks also have different needs than those with relatively homogeneous users. These differences should be the basis for adjustments, not an excuse to disregard vetting.

This framework also doesn't assume that all communication problems stem from language. Policy ambiguity can arise from unagreed objectives, overlapping authorities, or undecided procedures. In such circumstances, editing only improves the appearance of the problem without addressing its root cause. Analysis needs to distinguish language issues from issues of substance and management.

Theoretical Implications

This research's theoretical contribution lies in its attempt to reconcile objects often analyzed at different levels. Legal language focuses on the formulation and meaning of provisions, language policy addresses the regulation and position of language, and management examines the organization of implementation. An integrative framework connects the three by examining how information informs organizational action. This contribution extends analytical relationships, not the formation of validated theories.

This research also proposes a distinction between text quality, user comprehension, and organizational implementation. This distinction allows for a more specific diagnosis. Clear documents can face access issues, while available language services can face substantive accuracy issues. By separating these three issues, further research can develop measures that do not conflate causes and outcomes. Furthermore, the framework places context as part of the explanation of the relationships between dimensions. Using the same indicators across organizations can potentially overlook differences in needs and risks. Therefore, the propositions in this research need to be tested in light of the context in which

they are implemented. The conceptual value of the framework lies in its ability to guide more structured questions, rather than offering uniform answers.

Practical and Managerial Implications

The first practical implication is the need for integrated document review. Substance drafters, language reviewers, and implementation managers can assess documents based on their respective authorities and competencies. Reviewing should ensure that provisions are not only worded correctly but also clearly articulate the actions and support for their implementation. The form of coordination can be tailored to the size of the organization.

The second implication is prioritizing language support based on user needs. Organizations can identify the information that most impacts user rights, obligations, or decisions, then examine barriers to understanding. Support is selected based on identified issues, so translation, terminology clarification, and live assistance are not automatically treated as interchangeable options. These priorities need to be re-evaluated as user characteristics change.

The third implication is the development of feedback channels linked to document and process improvements. Repeated questions can be used to check difficult-to-understand information. However, an increase in the number of questions does not necessarily indicate a deterioration in communication quality; it may also reflect an increasingly user-friendly support channel. Interpretation of indicators therefore requires context.

CONCLUSION

Based on an integrative review of eleven journal articles, the relationship between language, law, and management in organizational governance can be explained through four interrelated dimensions: regulatory clarity, communication comprehensibility, language access, and implementation capacity. Regulatory clarity helps clarify obligations, authorities, and the limits of the application of provisions, while communication comprehensibility enables users to understand the information conveyed. Language access relates to support for users with different language needs, while implementation capacity encompasses responsibility, competence, resources, and implementation evaluation. This synthesis indicates that the existence of written policies needs to be accompanied by a match between the formulation of provisions, user needs, and the organization's ability to implement them.

The primary contribution of this research is the development of a conceptual framework that integrates language quality, legal regulation, and organizational governance into a single analytical approach. This framework helps differentiate between issues of document ambiguity, barriers to understanding, limited language access, and implementation weaknesses, allowing for targeted improvements to address the root causes. However, the proposed interdimensional relationships do not constitute causality because the research used a limited purposive corpus and inconsistent access to source content. Therefore, the study's findings should be positioned as a basis for developing evaluations and empirical research, taking into account the characteristics of the sector, users, and institutional environment.

SUGGESTION

Organizations are advised to conduct integrated policy and document reviews, involving the content drafters, language reviewers, and those responsible for implementation, according to their competencies. The review should include consistency of terminology, clarity of obligations and authorities, exception requirements, and ease of user access to explanations. Language support should be determined based on user needs and the consequences of misunderstandings, accompanied by a clear division of tasks, resources, and quality control mechanisms. Evaluations should also consider user understanding and follow-up improvements, so that success is not solely measured by the number of documents or communication activities produced.

Future research is recommended to expand the scope of the literature through documented searches, full-text reviews, and methodological quality assessments according to the research type. The resulting conceptual framework can be tested through comparative case studies, document comprehension tests, or longitudinal research on changes in practice following policy improvements. Testing should differentiate between text clarity, user comprehension, linguistic accessibility, and implementation capacity to more precisely assess the relationships between these dimensions. Thus, further research can produce validated evaluation instruments and recommendations that better align with organizational needs.

REFERENCE

- Cele, N. (2021). Understanding policy language as a tool for access and social inclusion in South African higher education: A critical policy analysis perspective. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 35 (6), 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.20853/35-6-3730>
- Hendrastuti, R., Okitasari, I., Lestariningsih, DN, Utami, RE, & Maemunah, E. (2024). The language acceptability of the Indonesian Omnibus Law: A structural approach. *LITE: Journal of Language, Literature, and Culture*, 20 (2), 223–241. <https://doi.org/10.33633/lite.v20i2.11326>
- Montle, M., & Kekana, T. J. (2024). Law-language: The challenge of the caveat 'whenever reasonably practicable' in language policies. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 8 (1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v8i1.8220>
- Muhtadi, A., Yusanto, Y., & Nesia, A. (2024). Legal information communication management (Penkum) of the Banten High Prosecutor's Office Public Relations for the nation's generation. *Indonesian National Journal*, 1 (2), 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.31848/jkri.v1i2.3405>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104 , 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Susanti, A., & Putri, UT (2025). From regulation to instruction: Embedding legal English in Indonesian law schools through ESP. *BAHA STRA*, 45 (2). <https://doi.org/10.26555/bs.v45i2.1659>

- Wang, L. (2022). Development of theoretical framework and research focus of language management in the new era. *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies*, 22 (3), 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1674-8921.2022.03.004>
- Wang, W. (2022). Translation policy in health care settings in Ontario: Problems, challenges and language ideologies. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 46 (3), 291–317. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.21049.wan>
- White, M. (2022). Managing corporate language diversity. *Business Information Review*, 39 (2), 56–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02663821221097205>
- Zhang, C., Zhao, R., & Huang, Y. (2023). The framework and features of language policies in global constitutional texts. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13 , Article 1064034. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1064034>
- Zhang, H., Ke, Y., & Liu, H. (2022). Language policies and organizational features of international organizations. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 46 (1), 26–54. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.21028.zha>
- Zuaro, B., Soler, J., & Björkman-Nylén, B. (2022). Language policy in Italian universities: Navigating the language ambiguities of higher education internationalisation. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 46 (3), 231–255. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.21029.zua>