



Amplifying Student Voice In Integrity Zone-Based University Complaint Systems

Ariatna^{1*}, Rita Suswati², Juli Rachmadani Hasibuan³, Yeni Erlita⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Department of English Language and Literature, Universitas Negeri Medan

*Penulis Korespondensi: ariatna@unimed.ac.id

Received: 03/07/2026 | Accepted: 06/08/2026 | Publication: 05/09/2026

Abstract: The implementation of Integrity Zone initiatives in higher education emphasizes transparency, accountability, and service quality as key principles of good governance. However, the standardization of student complaint-handling systems within the Integrity Zone framework remains underexplored. This study investigates students' needs for a standardized complaint-handling system in the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia. Using a descriptive needs analysis approach as the preliminary stage of an ADDIE-based Research and Development (R&D) project, data were collected from 135 students, consisting of 81 English Education students and 54 English Literature students. The instrument included ten Likert-scale items and four open-ended questions. Quantitative findings revealed a substantial gap between existing complaint-handling practices and students' expectations. The overall perception of the current system was moderate ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.94$). Low ratings were found for Information Transparency and Accessibility ($M = 2.22$, $SD = 1.07$), Procedural Certainty and Complaint Categorization ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 1.00$), and Complaint Resolution Effectiveness ($M = 2.26$, $SD = 0.95$). The lowest score was recorded for Safety and Procedural Protection ($M = 1.97$, $SD = 0.98$), indicating concerns regarding confidentiality and fear of academic retaliation. Conversely, students expressed very strong support for a standardized complaint-handling system ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.70$). Qualitative findings identified four key needs: anonymity protection, complaint tracking, procedural safeguards, and a web-based reporting platform. The findings provide an empirical foundation for developing an Integrity Zone-based SOP and digital complaint-management system to strengthen accountability, institutional trust, and service quality in higher education.

Keywords: Integrity Zone, Complaint Handling, Student Voice, Procedural Justice, Higher Education Governance, Digital Governance



Copyright © 2026, The Author(s).

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

How to Cite: Ariatna, Suswati, R., Hasibuan, J. R., & Erlita, Y. (2026). Amplifying student voice in integrity zone-based university complaint systems. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 6(4), 2293–2304. <https://doi.org/10.53625/jirk.v6i4.13186>

INTRODUCTION

Universities worldwide are increasingly expected to implement governance systems emphasizing transparency, accountability, participation, and service quality. Beyond traditional education and research, modern universities function as public service organizations responsible for ensuring practices respond directly to stakeholder needs, particularly students (Giannini, 2025; Ryan et al., 2022). Higher education reforms have consequently shifted from bureaucratic management toward governance prioritizing stakeholder engagement, institutional legitimacy, and continuous quality improvement (Van

Damme & Zahner, 2022). International governance frameworks emphasize that meaningful student participation, including secure grievance mechanisms, constitutes an essential pillar of university governance, enabling institutions to refine decision-making, identify vulnerabilities, and strengthen public trust (Muh et al., 2023).

A vital yet frequently neglected component of good governance is a standardized student complaint-handling system. Complaint mechanisms function not merely as administrative dispute-resolution procedures, but as strategic instruments for institutional learning, quality assurance, and organizational accountability (Douwes et al., 2023; Supriyanto et al., 2025). Well-designed systems allow institutions to identify service deficiencies, monitor administrative performance, and implement evidence-based improvements. More importantly, transparent procedures empower students to participate actively in governance by providing feedback on academic and non-academic services (Watson et al., 2016). As higher education becomes increasingly service-oriented, complaint-handling efficiency, accessibility, and integrity have emerged as crucial benchmarks of credibility and operational excellence (Douwes et al., 2023; Ryan et al., 2022).

In Indonesia, bureaucratic reform enforced through the *Zona Integritas* (Integrity Zone) initiative reinforces the imperative for transparent governance within state universities (Ranu et al., 2024). The framework mandates creating corruption-free regions (*WBK*) and clean, serving bureaucratic regions (*WBBM*) by strengthening accountability, public supervision, procedural fairness, and grievance management (Kementerian PANRB, 2021). State universities are obligated to establish transparent, accessible, and accountable complaint mechanisms that safeguard complainants throughout reporting through structural guarantees of confidentiality, procedural certainty, objective investigations, timely resolutions, and systematic tracking (Van Damme & Zahner, 2022).

This imperative can be conceptualized through two complementary theoretical perspectives: Student Voice Theory and Procedural Justice Theory. Student Voice Theory posits that students should be treated as active partners in governance rather than passive consumers, requiring robust structures capable of translating feedback into organizational improvements (Jones & Hall, 2022; Matthews & Dollinger, 2023). Procedural Justice Theory asserts that individuals trust authorities when organizational processes are perceived as fair, transparent, consistent, and respectful (Główniczewski & Burdziej, 2023). In academic settings, perceptions of procedural fairness directly shape trust, institutional identification, and engagement, often predicting legitimacy more strongly than favorable outcomes alone (Supriyanto et al., 2025).

Despite growing literature on university governance, research has predominantly focused on generic student satisfaction, quality assurance, digital transformation, or broad performance indicators (Muh et al., 2023). Few studies critically examine complaint standardization within Integrity Zone frameworks in developing nations. Existing academic complaint mechanisms often remain fragmented, bureaucratic, and ill-equipped to address power asymmetries between students and staff, instilling fear of retaliation and suppressing formal reporting (Douwes et al., 2023). Methodologically, previous studies rely heavily on quantitative satisfaction surveys or performance metrics, offering limited insight into procedural needs regarding anonymity, safety, tracking, and transparency (Matthews &

Dollinger, 2023). A notable empirical gap remains in combining quantitative evaluations with qualitative needs assessments to inform Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and digital tools within Research and Development (R&D) frameworks (Jones & Hall, 2022; Watson et al., 2016).

This gap is acutely evident in the Department of English Language and Literature at Universitas Negeri Medan (UNIMED), Indonesia, where complaint handling relies on informal, ad-hoc communications lacking standardized workflows, confidentiality guarantees, tracking, and mandated timeframes. Preliminary empirical investigations reveal a substantial disconnect between current practices and student expectations, with general perceptions remaining low and safety/protection receiving the lowest ratings due to fear of academic retaliation. Conversely, student support for a standardized, secure system is overwhelmingly strong, highlighting four imperative needs: strict anonymity, real-time tracking, procedural safeguards against retaliation, and a dedicated web-based reporting platform.

To bridge these gaps, this study undertakes a comprehensive needs analysis as the preliminary phase of an ADDIE-based R&D project. The novelty lies in synthesizing Integrity Zone mandates, Student Voice Theory, Procedural Justice Theory, and digital governance into a unified framework positioning complaint management as a strategic tool for institutional trust and public service quality (Główniczewski & Burdziej, 2023; Matthews & Dollinger, 2023). Specifically, this study addresses how students in the Department of English Language and Literature perceive the existing complaint-handling system, and what essential procedural safeguards and digital features must be integrated into an Integrity Zone-based SOP. By establishing an empirical baseline, this research provides a foundation for designing an Integrity Zone-compliant SOP and integrated digital complaint system to elevate service quality, administrative accountability, and student trust.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Higher Education Governance and Bureaucratic Reform in Indonesia

The global landscape of higher education has undergone a profound paradigm shift from traditional, management-centric administration toward modern governance frameworks emphasizing transparency, accountability, stakeholder participation, and public service excellence (Giannini, 2025; Ryan et al., 2022). Universities are increasingly recognized as complex public service organizations obligated to demonstrate high standards of ethical decision-making, institutional responsiveness, and administrative integrity (Muh et al., 2023). Effective university governance relies on structural mechanisms that foster meaningful stakeholder engagement, enable constructive institutional critique, and protect democratic participation across operational levels (Hart & Coates, 2010).

In Indonesia, this global imperative aligns directly with national bureaucratic reform mandates enforced through the Zona Integritas (Integrity Zone) initiative. Promulgated by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (Kementerian PANRB, 2021), the Integrity Zone framework serves as a strategic mandate for state universities to achieve corruption-free environments (WBK) and clean, serving administrative environments (WBBM). The framework encompasses six core operational areas: change management, process deregulation, human resources, supervisory strengthening, performance accountability, and public service quality improvement (Ranu et al., 2024). In higher education, implementing these principles mandates operational mechanisms empowering students and academic stakeholders to voice grievances, report maladministration, and demand transparency through standardized, secure procedures (Kementerian PANRB, 2021; Van Damme & Zahner, 2022).

Complaint Management Systems as Strategic Governance Instruments

In contemporary higher education, complaint-handling systems serve as strategic tools for internal quality assurance, operational learning, and organizational accountability rather than mere reactive dispute-resolution channels (Supriyanto et al., 2025; Watson et al., 2016). Well-designed workflows enable administrators to detect administrative failures, identify vulnerabilities, evaluate service deficiencies, and implement evidence-based corrective policies (Young & Jerome, 2020).

However, empirical literature indicates that university complaint mechanisms often remain severely fragmented, highly bureaucratic, and inadequately standardized (Douwes et al., 2023). Informal, ad-hoc practices—such as relying on personal relationships with advisors or department heads—frequently lack documented workflows, confidentiality guarantees, progress tracking, and enforced timelines (Resch, 2023). When grievance mechanisms lack structural formality, power asymmetries become magnified; students fear academic retaliation, breaches of confidentiality, or social marginalization, suppressing reporting behavior and allowing deficiencies to persist uncorrected (Douwes et al., 2023; Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023). Consequently, standardizing complaint procedures through formal Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) is an operational necessity for safeguarding complainants, elevating administrative credibility, and fostering trust (Watson et al., 2016).

Theoretical Frameworks: Student Voice and Procedural Justice

The conceptual foundation of standardized complaint management is rooted in Student Voice Theory, which challenges traditional, paternalistic higher education models by asserting that students must be treated as active governance partners rather than passive consumers (Jones & Hall, 2022; Matthews & Dollinger, 2022). Authentic engagement requires formal structural pathways where student feedback and grievances are solicited, evaluated, and translated into organizational reforms (Young & Jerome, 2020). Scholars distinguish between superficial student representation and genuine partnership (Matthews & Dollinger, 2022; Resch, 2023), which occurs when governance frameworks provide accessible, safe, and transparent channels to articulate concerns without fear of adverse consequences (Jones & Hall, 2022). Embedding student voice into quality assurance enhances decision-making accuracy, cultivates democratic culture, and strengthens campus engagement (Resch, 2023).

Complementing this, Procedural Justice Theory provides a psychological framework for understanding how complaint processes shape trust, organizational identification, and authority legitimacy (Supriyanto et al., 2025). Individuals evaluate institutions predominantly on the perceived fairness, transparency, consistency, and respectfulness of decision-making processes rather than substantive outcomes alone. In academic complaint handling, procedural justice comprises four core dimensions: voice and neutrality through unbiased decision-makers (Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023); procedural transparency and consistent rule application across all cases (Watson et al., 2016); respectful treatment with absolute confidentiality and explicit protection against retaliation (Douwes et al., 2023); and institutional trustworthiness demonstrated through timely responses and objective investigations (Supriyanto et al., 2025). When students perceive grievance procedures as procedurally fair, institutional trust and compliance increase significantly, even if outcomes are unfavorable, whereas opaque or retaliatory environments severely erode legitimacy (Douwes et al., 2023).

Digital Governance and Theoretical Synthesis

Digital Governance Frameworks enhance operational efficiency, transparency, and accessibility by replacing traditional paper-based or verbal channels with web-based reporting platforms (Alex, 2023). Digital platforms enable encrypted anonymous submissions to mitigate fear of exposure (Alex, 2023), automated tracking for real-time status monitoring (Oguntosin et al., 2021), and aggregated trend data for identifying administrative bottlenecks, provided cybersecurity and data privacy are rigorously maintained (Braunack-Mayer et al., 2020).

Despite extensive literature on governance, quality assurance, and digital tools, significant empirical gaps remain as most studies examine student voice, procedural justice, Integrity Zone mandates, and digital tools in isolation rather than within a unified framework in developing nations (Douwes et al., 2023; Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023; Muh et al., 2023). Methodologically, research relies predominantly on generic satisfaction surveys rather than comprehensive R&D needs analyses (Matthews & Dollinger, 2022; Resch, 2023). This study bridges these gaps by synthesizing Integrity Zone policy mandates, Student Voice Theory, Procedural Justice Theory, and Digital Governance into a unified framework, providing the empirical baseline within the Department of English Language and Literature at Universitas Negeri Medan to design an Integrity Zone-compliant SOP and integrated web-based complaint management system.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Context

This study adopted a descriptive mixed-methods needs analysis design situated within the foundational "Analysis" phase of the ADDIE (Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, Evaluation) Research and Development (R&D) model (Branch & Dousay, 2021). Needs analysis serves as a rigorous framework for evaluating organizational performance, identifying operational gaps, and establishing an empirical baseline for policy design and institutional reform (Brown, 2021; Ferguson & Phau, 2012). The primary objective was to conduct a diagnostic evaluation of undergraduate experiences, structural

anxieties, and operational expectations regarding complaint handling in the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). A total of 135 active students participated, comprising 81 from English Language Education and 54 from English Literature. Participants were recruited via convenience sampling with purposeful criteria across academic cohorts to capture authentic stakeholder perceptions across various grievance types (Etikan & Bala, 2017).

Research Instrumentation and Data Collection

Data were gathered using a dual-part instrument designed around Integrity Zone mandates, Procedural Justice Theory, and digital governance. The quantitative section contained ten 5-point Likert-scale items measuring five dimensions: Information Transparency and Accessibility, Procedural Certainty and Complaint Categorization, Complaint Resolution Effectiveness, Safety and Procedural Protection, and System Standardization Support. The qualitative section comprised four open-ended prompts eliciting narrative descriptions of reporting experiences, systemic barriers, required safeguards, and desired digital features (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The instrument underwent formal expert review by three academic evaluators to confirm content validity and alignment with procedural justice constructs (Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023; Matthews & Dollinger, 2023), while pilot testing confirmed high internal consistency for the quantitative section (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.85$) (Pallant, 2020). Data collection occurred during the 2025–2026 academic year using secure online forms. Ethical protocols ensured informed consent, voluntary participation, full right to withdraw, and strict data anonymity through numerical coding.

Data Analysis Strategies

Quantitative Likert-scale data were processed using descriptive statistics in SPSS (Pallant, 2020), analyzing central tendency trends and dispersion patterns across construct dimensions to diagnose operational gaps and verify consistency across study programs. Qualitative responses were analyzed using Reflexive Thematic Analysis following the six-phase framework established by Braun and Clarke (2021), progressing sequentially through data familiarization, initial code generation for recurring reporting fears and technical requirements, theme searching, theme reviewing against raw narratives, theme defining, and final report production. Synthesizing quantitative evaluations with qualitative thematic structures provided a comprehensive, empirically validated foundation for the subsequent design and development stages of the Integrity Zone R&D project (Branch & Dousay, 2021; Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

RESULTS

This diagnostic study ($N = 135$) investigated student perceptions of complaint handling under *Zona Integritas* mandates. The findings reveal substantial empirical gaps across current complaint management practices, accompanied by an overwhelming student demand for institutional reform through standardized operating procedures and digital governance tools.

Quantitative Findings

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistical parameters—comprising mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and qualitative interpretations—across the five investigated dimensions.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Dimension	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Interpretation
Information Transparency and Accessibility	2.22	1.07	Low
Safety and Procedural Protection	1.97	0.98	Very Low
Procedural Certainty and Complaint Categorization	2.29	1.00	Low
Complaint Resolution Effectiveness	2.26	0.95	Low
Need for Standardized SOP	4.38	0.70	Very High
Overall Governance Perception	2.62	0.94	Moderate

Overall perception of the existing system was moderate-to-low ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.94$), exposing critical operational vulnerabilities. The lowest rating occurred in Safety and Procedural Protection ($M = 1.97$, $SD = 0.98$, Very Low), revealing deep psychological insecurity from absent confidentiality guarantees and fear of academic retaliation (Douwes et al., 2023; Główniczewski & Burdziej, 2023).

Three operational dimensions received consistently low ratings: Information Transparency and Accessibility ($M = 2.22$, $SD = 1.07$), Complaint Resolution Effectiveness ($M = 2.26$, $SD = 0.95$), and Procedural Certainty ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 1.00$). These low scores reflect systemic ambiguity regarding submission pathways and dissatisfaction with resolution speed and follow-up communication (Watson et al., 2016).

Conversely, the dimension evaluating the Need for a Standardized SOP achieved an exceptionally high rating ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.70$, Very High). The low standard deviation underscores a strong, unified consensus across both English Education and English Literature programs regarding the urgent necessity of establishing a formal, Integrity Zone-aligned complaint mechanism and digital governance platform.

To provide granular clarity, Table 2 presents the item-level mean scores across the ten questionnaire items.

Table 2. Mean scores

Item Code	Survey Item Statement	Mean Score (M)
Item 1	Transparency of complaint guidelines and submission procedures	2.21
Item 2	Accessibility of formal complaint channels within the department	2.23
Item 3	Institutional guarantees of confidentiality and protection for complainants	1.88
Item 4	Absence of fear regarding academic retaliation when submitting grievances	2.05
Item 5	Clarity of procedural workflows and complaint stage categorization	2.23

Item 6	Timeliness and responsiveness of departmental administration in handling complaints	2.34
Item 7	Objectivity, fairness, and effectiveness of complaint investigations and resolutions	2.42
Item 8	Availability of tracking mechanisms to monitor complaint status	2.09
Item 9	Urgency of developing an Integrity Zone-compliant Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)	4.35
Item 10	Necessity of implementing a secure, web-based digital complaint management platform	4.40

Item-level analysis reinforces dimensional trends, with Items 1 through 8 scoring below the neutral 3.00 threshold ($M = 1.88$ to 2.42), indicating significant stakeholder dissatisfaction (Pallant, 2020). Item 3 recorded the lowest score ($M = 1.88$), proving informal channels fail to secure confidentiality. Closely following were Item 4 ($M = 2.05$) and Item 8 ($M = 2.09$), identifying fear of retaliation and absent status tracking as primary reporting barriers.

On the other hand, Item 9 ($M = 4.35$) and Item 10 ($M = 4.40$) demonstrated overwhelming endorsement for structural intervention. Students strongly agreed that a formal SOP and secure web-based platform are indispensable prerequisites for restoring procedural justice and administrative legitimacy in higher education (Matthews & Dollinger, 2023).

Qualitative Findings

Reflexive thematic analysis of open-ended responses yielded four major qualitative themes. First, students reported pervasive fear of academic intimidation and retaliation stemming from power asymmetries, explaining low procedural protection scores ($M = 1.97$) and illustrating how unstandardized environments silence student voice (Douwes et al., 2023; Hart & Coates, 2010). Second, respondents explicitly demanded structural anonymity as a non-negotiable buffer, ensuring grievances are evaluated on factual merit rather than identity (Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023). Third, participants highlighted an urgent need for procedural safeguards and fixed timeframes, noting that unstandardized complaints frequently vanished without feedback, requiring formal SOPs outlining investigation stages and appeal pathways (Muh et al., 2023; Ryan et al., 2022). Fourth, students strongly preferred integrated web-based reporting platforms to enhance accessibility, enforce real-time tracking, and align operations with Integrity Zone principles via encrypted submissions (Braunack-Mayer et al., 2020; Ryan et al., 2022).

Together, these results establish a compelling case for institutional reform. High student consensus for SOP standardization ($M = 4.38$) and digital platform implementation ($M = 4.40$) provides a clear operational blueprint for subsequent ADDIE R&D phases to achieve procedural justice, anonymity, and reporting safety.

DISCUSSION

The empirical findings reveal a profound disconnect between existing ad-hoc, informal complaint practices and students' fundamental governance expectations within the

Department of English Language and Literature at Universitas Negeri Medan. Students perceive informal practices as opaque, unpredictable, and inefficient. Conversely, overwhelming student support for SOP standardization and digital platform implementation indicates that students demand systems grounded in procedural fairness, structural protection, and operational transparency (Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023; Ryan et al., 2022). Bridging this gap requires transitioning to a standardized governance framework that transforms individual grievances into institutional learning (Giannini, 2025; Watson et al., 2016).

The primary structural vulnerability highlighted is students' acute insecurity regarding absent confidentiality guarantees and fear of academic retaliation, such as intimidation or biased grading. These findings directly corroborate Douwes et al.'s (2023) examination of university complaint governance, demonstrating that unstandardized environments amplify power asymmetries and silence student voice. Under Student Voice Theory, authentic participation cannot flourish under psychological threat or administrative vulnerability (Jones & Hall, 2022; Young & Jerome, 2020). Institutions must establish explicit anti-retaliation policies backed by administrative sanctions and anonymous reporting mechanisms, which decouple issue merit from complainant identity to mitigate fear, increase reporting, and facilitate early detection of maladministration (Ferguson & Phau, 2012; Ryan et al., 2022).

The demand for anonymity, strict confidentiality, and tracking validates Procedural Justice Theory, which posits that institutional legitimacy hinges on perceived procedural fairness, neutrality, and respect (Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023). In higher education, procedural fairness predicts student trust and identification more strongly than outcomes alone (Supriyanto et al., 2025). These considerations inform essential SOP design policies: stringent confidentiality protocols with encrypted document workflows; automated real-time tracking with unique case IDs to eliminate opacity (Główczewski & Burdziej, 2023; Oguntosin et al., 2021); and differentiated reporting pathways for academic and non-academic grievances to ensure specialized, efficient case handling (Douwes et al., 2023). Additionally, addressing frustration with administrative inertia requires codifying maximum response timeframes, explicit investigation protocols, and clear appeal channels (Muh et al., 2023; Ryan et al., 2022).

Furthermore, strong preference for an integrated web-based platform underscores the role of digital transformation in replacing vulnerable paper-based or verbal channels (Ryan et al., 2022; Watson et al., 2016). Web-based systems provide encrypted submissions, automated ticket generation, real-time tracking, and centralized oversight (Braunack-Mayer et al., 2020). In Indonesia, transitioning to a digital platform directly operationalizes national mandates for Integrity Zones (*Zona Integritas*) toward Corruption-Free (*WBK*) and Clean/Serving (*WBBM*) regions (Kementerian PANRB, 2021; Ranu et al., 2024). Digital platforms fulfill supervision mandates by creating audit trails, enforcing deadlines, and generating data for administrative risk assessments (Supriyanto et al., 2025), provided systems maintain robust cybersecurity and privacy protections (Braunack-Mayer et al., 2020).

Synthesizing these findings yields an operational blueprint where Integrity Zone mandates provide policy obligations, Student Voice Theory legitimizes partnership, Procedural Justice Theory defines safety, and Digital Governance provides execution infrastructure. Ultimately, an Integrity Zone-based SOP must integrate anonymous reporting, real-time tracking, differentiated pathways, strict confidentiality, enforceable timelines, and secure digital governance to elevate administrative accountability, protect student welfare, and achieve service excellence (Matthews & Dollinger, 2023; Watson et al., 2016).

CONCLUSION

This study investigated student perceptions regarding complaint-handling standardization at Universitas Negeri Medan under the *Zona Integritas* mandate. Findings reveal a profound gap between existing ad-hoc channels—perceived as opaque and unsafe due to power asymmetries and retaliation fears—and student expectations favoring formal SOPs and web-based platforms with anonymity, confidentiality, fixed timelines, and digital tracking.

These results bridge Student Voice Theory, Procedural Justice Theory, and Digital Governance Frameworks, framing complaint management as a strategic instrument for legitimacy, organizational learning, and trust (Matthews & Dollinger, 2023; Watson et al., 2016). Establishing procedural fairness enables genuine, protected partnership (Jones & Hall, 2022; Young & Jerome, 2020), while operationalizing Integrity Zone principles (Kementerian PANRB, 2021) advances public service excellence (Muh et al., 2023; Ryan et al., 2022).

Practically, ADDIE R&D phases (WBBM) must implement six pillars: anonymity toggles (Douwes et al., 2023), real-time status tracking (Głowczewski & Burdziej, 2023), differentiated academic channels (Watson et al., 2016), encrypted confidentiality (Braunack-Mayer et al., 2020), mandated timelines (Muh et al., 2023; Ryan et al., 2022), and anti-retaliation protections (Douwes et al., 2023). Future multi-site research should evaluate active platforms and causal interactions across diverse stakeholders. Ultimately, standardizing grievance mechanisms eliminates silence, ensuring academic excellence and clean public governance (Matthews & Dollinger, 2023; Watson et al., 2016).

REFERENCES

- Alex, A. O. I. (2023). An automated and robust tertiary institution web-based student complaint management system. *International Research Journal of Innovations in Engineering and Technology (IRJIET)*, 7(12), 110-124. <https://doi.org/10.47001/IRJIET/2023.712016>
- Branch, R. M., & Dousay, T. A. (2021). *Survey of instructional development models* (6th ed.). Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT).
- Braunack-Mayer, A. J., Street, J. M., Tooher, R., Feng, X., & Scharling-Gamba, K. (2020). Student and staff perspectives on the use of big data in the tertiary education sector: A scoping review and reflection on the ethical issues. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(6), 877-918. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320960213>

- Brown, J. D. (2021). *Introducing needs analysis and English for specific purposes*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003022435>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Douwes, R., Metselaar, J., Pijnenborg, G. H. M., & Boonstra, N. (2023). Well-being of students in higher education: The importance of a student perspective. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), 2190697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2190697>
- Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6), 215–217.
<https://www.academia.edu/download/76605654/BBIJ-05-00149.pdf>
- Ferguson, G., & Phau, I. (2012). A cross-national investigation of university students' complaining behaviour and attitudes to complaining. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 5(1), 50-70. <https://doi.org/10.1108/18363261211261755>
- Główczewski, M., & Burdziej, S. (2023). (In)justice in academia: Procedural fairness, students' academic identification, and perceived legitimacy of university authorities. *Higher Education*, 86(1), 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00907-8>
- Giannini, S. (2025). Reimagining the futures of education. *Prospects*, 5, 299-307.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-025-09740-0>
- Hart, D. J., & Coates, N. F. (2010). International student complaint behaviour: How do East Asian students complain to their university?. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 34(3), 303-319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2010.484051>
- Jones, M.-A., & Hall, V. (2022). Redefining student voice: Applying the lens of critical pragmatism. *Oxford Review of Education*, 48(5), 570–586.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2021.2003190>
- Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi (PANRB). (2021). *Peraturan Menteri PANRB nomor 90 tahun 2021 tentang pembangunan dan evaluasi zona integritas menuju wilayah bebas dari korupsi dan wilayah birokrasi bersih dan melayani di instansi pemerintah*. <https://jdih.menpan.go.id/dokumen-hukum/peraturan-menteri-pendayagunaan-aparatur-negara-dan-reformasi-birokrasi-nomor-90-tahun-2021-tentang-1488>
- Matthews, K. E., & Dollinger, M. (2023). Student voice in higher education: The importance of distinguishing student representation and student partnership. *Higher Education*, 85(3), 555–570. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00851-7>
- Muh, I., Munirul, A., & Evra, W. (2023). Justice in handling complaints and its impact on satisfaction and loyalty in higher education. *Перспективы науки и образования*, 1(61), 24-39. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/justice-in-handling-complaints-and-its-impact-on-satisfaction-and-loyalty-in-higher-education>
- Oguntosin, V., Oluwadurotimi, M., Adoghe, A., Abdulkareem, A., & Adeyemi, G. (2021). Development of a web-based complaint management platform for a university community. *Journal of Engineering Science & Technology Review*, 14(1).
<https://doi.org/10.25103/jestr.141.17>
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

- Ranu, M. E., Hermanto, F. Y., Susilowati, F. D., Fahmi, M. F., Amirusholihin, A., & Ramdhan, M. R. (2024). Implementation of integrity zones in educational institutions: Problems and readiness for innovation. *International Journal of Emerging Research and Review*, 2(4), 000090. <https://doi.org/10.56707/ijer.v2i4.90>
- Resch, K. (2023). Student voice in higher education diversity policies: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, 1039578. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1039578>
- Ryan, T., Baik, C., & Larcombe, W. (2022). How can universities better support the mental wellbeing of higher degree research students? A study of students' suggestions. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(3), 867-881. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1874886>
- Supriyanto, A., Burhanuddin, B., Sunarni, S., Rochmawati, R., Ratri, D. K., & Bhayangkara, A. N. (2025). Academic service quality, student satisfaction and loyalty: a study at higher education legal entities in Indonesia. *The TQM Journal*, 37(5), 1364-1384. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-10-2023-0334>
- Van Damme, D., & Zahner, D. (2022). *Does higher education teach students to think critically?* OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/cc9fa6aa-en>
- Watson, S., Lindsay, J., Kalogeropoulou, K., Proyer, M., & Scott-Hunt, S. (2016). A study of the effectiveness of using early resolution methods to resolve student complaints in Higher Education. <https://researchinnovation.kingston.ac.uk/files/48218478/Watson-S-33996.pdf>
- Young, H., & Jerome, L. (2020). Student voice in higher education: Opening the loop. *British Educational Research Journal*, 46(3), 688-705. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3603>