

## INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

**Kharisma Nourma Rani**

State Development Administration Study Program, Concentration in Public Policy Management,  
Politeknik STIA LAN Jakarta

Email: [nourmaranikharisma@gmail.com](mailto:nourmaranikharisma@gmail.com)

Received: 02/06/2026 | Revised : 11/06/2026 | Accepted: 23/06/2026 | Published :08/07/2026

### Abstract

Public complaint management is a critical instrument for strengthening accountability, responsiveness, and supervisory quality in local government. This article analyzes the implementation of public complaint management at the Inspectorate of Karawang Regency and formulates an integrated classification model that connects the normative basis of complaints with operational priorities for follow-up actions. The study employed a descriptive qualitative approach using document review, process observation, and analysis of complaint data from 2023 to 2025. The data were analyzed through an interactive model consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The findings show that complaint management has been supported by multiple reporting channels, particularly the Tangkar application and written letters, yet it still faces challenges in complaint classification, interpretation of completion status, and the high proportion of complaints closed administratively. Of 130 complaints recorded between 2023 and 2025, only 15 complaints, or 11.5%, were followed up through special audit or investigative mechanisms, while 115 complaints, or 88.5%, were archived or administratively closed. These findings indicate the need for a classification model that distinguishes supervisory and non-supervisory complaints while mapping urgency and importance using the Eisenhower Matrix. The proposed model assigns complaints into four follow-up priorities to support more consistent, transparent, and accountable decision-making.

**Keywords:** *Public Complaints; Inspectorate; Complaint Classification; Eisenhower Matrix; Public Accountability.*

### INTRODUCTION

Quality public services are a key indicator of successful regional governance. Within the framework of public administration, public services are understood not only as service provision activities but also as an accountability relationship between the government and the public. Law Number 25 of 2009 affirms that the public has the right to submit complaints when services do not meet standards, while service providers are required to provide a complaint management mechanism that is accessible and actionable. Thus, public complaints become part of the public oversight system for government performance.

Developments in governance demonstrate that public complaints can no longer be treated as merely administrative grievances. Complaints can be a primary source of information about maladministration, abuse of authority, extortion, conflicts of interest, weak governance of regional government agencies, and service inconsistencies with applicable standards. From a good governance perspective, complaint channels strengthen participation, responsiveness, transparency, and accountability because citizens are given the space to share experiences and evidence not always visible in formal bureaucratic reports (Bovens, 2007; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). Nationally, the government has established a complaint management framework through Presidential Regulation Number 76 of 2013 concerning Public Service Complaint Management and the strengthening of SP4N-LAPOR! as a national public service complaint management system. The SP4N 2020-2024 Road Map positions complaints as a means to improve service quality, strengthen inter-

# INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

Kharisma Nourma Rani

agency coordination, and expedite the resolution of public reports (Ministry of PANRB, 2020). At the regional government level, Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 8 of 2023 details complaint management within the Ministry of Home Affairs and regional governments, including regulations regarding complaint review, verification, classification, and follow-up.

Karawang Regency has established several public complaint channels, including letters, the Tangkar app, SP4N-LAPOR!, and the Whistleblowing System. The existence of these channels demonstrates that the local government has opened up a space for the public to convey complaints, aspirations, and alleged irregularities. However, the existence of these channels does not automatically guarantee effective complaint resolution. Several studies on SP4N-LAPOR! indicate that the main challenge in complaint management lies not only in access but also in response speed, transparency of report status, clarity of categorization, and consistency of follow-up (Yahya & Setiyono, 2022; Muttaqin & Pusvita, 2023; Fadli, 2025). In the context of Karawang Regency, the Inspectorate holds a strategic position due to its authority to oversee the implementation of regional government. The Special Assistant Inspectorate is the unit directly responsible for handling complaints containing supervisory elements. However, not all complaints received have the same level of oversight and urgency. Some reports allege serious irregularities and require prompt action, while others are administrative complaints, incomplete initial information, or reports that are more appropriately handled by technical regional authorities. This situation demands a classification system that can differentiate the characteristics of reports more operationally.

Complaint data from the Karawang Regency Inspectorate from 2023 to 2025 shows 130 complaints received through various channels. Of these, 15 were followed up through Specific Purpose Audits (PDTT), while 115 ended up as archives or administrative resolutions. This proportion indicates that the majority of complaints have not been directed to substantive oversight mechanisms. However, the high number of archives should not be interpreted as a failure, as some reports may not meet audit requirements. The key issue is whether the reasons for filing, the form of verification, and the status of follow-up are clearly documented. Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 8 of 2023 provides important guidance by distinguishing between complaints with supervisory and non-supervisory levels. This distinction serves as a basis for local governments to prevent all complaints from being treated uniformly. In organizational practice, this normative distinction still needs to be translated into operational tools so that officers can determine priorities, choose follow-up paths, and explain decisions to complainants. Therefore, strengthening complaint management cannot be achieved simply by adding channels; it needs to be directed at the decision architecture after a report is received.

This study proposes the use of the Eisenhower Matrix as a prioritization tool. The matrix maps issues based on two dimensions: importance and urgency. In complaint management, the importance dimension can be linked to the substance of supervision, risk of loss, abuse of authority, public impact, and the Inspectorate's authority. Meanwhile, the urgency dimension can be linked to the need for a rapid response, risk of evidence loss, conflict escalation, service deadlines, and potential ongoing losses. Thus, the Eisenhower Matrix can complement normative classifications to allow for more measurable follow-up decisions. Based on this background, this article aims to analyze the implementation of public complaint management at the Karawang Regency Inspectorate and formulate an integrated complaint classification model. This integration involves combining complaint classifications based on the level of supervision and operational priorities based on importance and urgency. This article is expected to contribute academically to the study of public administration, particularly in the areas of complaint management, policy implementation, and regional oversight accountability.

## METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach. This approach was chosen because the objective was not to statistically test relationships between variables, but rather to understand complaint management practices, interpret gaps in policy implementation, and develop an operational model appropriate to the context of the Karawang Regency Inspectorate. The qualitative approach allowed researchers to gain a deeper understanding of the processes, documents, actors' roles, and the meanings behind the administrative status of complaints (Miles et al., 2014). The research data sources include primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through observations of the complaint management process and information from actors related to the receipt, verification, disposition, and follow-up of reports. Secondary data were obtained from the Karawang Regency Inspectorate's complaint recapitulation for 2023-2025, the Irbansus functional position map, laws and regulations, regional policy documents, and academic literature on policy implementation and public complaint management. The analysis focused on four aspects. First, the alignment of

# INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

Kharisma Nourma Rani

complaint management practices with the regulatory framework, particularly Home Affairs Ministerial Regulation No. 8 of 2023 and related regional regulations. Second, the pattern of complaint data based on channels, number of reports, follow-up to PDTT (Disaster Management Implementation Unit), and archiving. Third, institutional capacity, as measured by Irbansus' human resources and the division of roles in complaint handling. Fourth, the need for a classification model that can bridge normative classification and operational decisions.

The data analysis technique follows an interactive model that includes data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing (Miles et al., 2014). Data reduction is carried out by sorting information relevant to the problem formulation, particularly complaint data, regulatory substance, and findings regarding follow-up mechanisms. Data presentation is carried out through tables and thematic descriptions to systematically display complaint patterns, resource limitations, and classification needs. Conclusions are drawn by linking empirical findings to theories of policy implementation, accountability, and complaint governance. The validity of the analysis is maintained through source triangulation, which involves comparing complaint summary data, regulatory documents, institutional documents, and academic literature. Triangulation is necessary because the administrative status of a report does not always reflect the substance of the resolution. In public complaint research, quantitative data, such as the number of reports or the percentage of resolution, must be interpreted in conjunction with the process flow, the basis for decision-making, and the organization's ability to explain follow-up actions to the complainant.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Overview of Public Complaints 2023-2025

Data on public complaints received by the Karawang Regency Inspectorate from 2023 to 2025 shows that complaint channels were used with varying intensity. The Tangkar app was the most dominant channel, followed by letters and SP4N-LAPOR!. Meanwhile, the WBS channel recorded no complaints during the same period. This indicates that the public tends to use regional channels that are more familiar or closer to the local service ecosystem. Of the total 130 complaints, the Tangkar application contributed 86 reports, or approximately 66.2%, letters contributed 40 reports, or approximately 30.8%, and SP4N-LAPOR! contributed 4 reports, or approximately 3.1%. This composition indicates that regional digital channels play a significant role in receiving complaints, but integration with the national system still needs to be strengthened. A study of LAPOR trends shows that channel management is a critical issue because the success of the complaints system depends on channel connectivity, clear flow, and consistent follow-up across agencies (Muttaqin & Pusvita, 2023).

**Table 1. Recapitulation of Public Complaints through the Karawang Regency Inspectorate 2023-2025**

Channel	2023 Total	2023 PDTT	2023 Archives	2024 Total	2024 PDTT	2024 Archives	2025 Total	2025 PDTT	2025 Archives
Letter	26	3	23	10	5	5	4	1	3
Tangkar Application	31	0	31	16	1	15	39	5	34
SP4N-REPORT!	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3
WBS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amount	58	3	55	26	6	20	46	6	40

Source: Data from the Public Complaints Admin of the Karawang Regency Inspectorate, processed by researchers.

Based on the follow-up pattern, only 15 reports, or 11.5%, were followed up through PDTT, while 115 reports, or 88.5%, ended up in the archives or administrative resolution categories. These figures should be read with caution. On the one hand, not all complaints are worthy of follow-up through special investigations, as some reports may not meet the requirements for substance, evidence, authority, or urgency. On the other hand, the very high proportion of reports filed requires clarification on the basis for report closure to prevent the completion status from being perceived as merely

# INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

Kharisma Nourma Rani

an administrative closure. These findings align with several studies on SP4N-LAPOR!, which show that the effectiveness of public complaints is often hampered by clear follow-up actions, transparency of report status, and the organization's ability to close reports with reasons understandable to the public (Yahya & Setiyono, 2022; Kurniawan et al., 2024; Fadli, 2025). Within a public accountability framework, simply stating that a report has been received is insufficient. Organizations also need to explain how reports are verified, why they are followed up or archived, and what corrective actions emerge from the process (Bovens, 2007).

Data patterns indicate that the primary problem lies not in the absence of complaint channels, but rather in the process after a complaint is received. Open channels provide opportunities for public participation, but they must be accompanied by a consistent process of classification, verification, and prioritization. Without such a process, complaints of very different severity can end up in the same channel, making it difficult for organizations to distinguish between reports requiring investigation, clarification, coordination with regional agencies, or requests for complete data.

## Institutional Capacity and Complaint Management Burden

Institutional capacity is a crucial factor in implementing complaint management policies. Policy implementation theory explains that successful policy implementation is influenced by clear standards, resources, communication, implementer disposition, and bureaucratic structure (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975; Edwards III, 1980). In the context of the Karawang Regency Inspectorate, this capacity is evident in the number and composition of human resources handling the oversight and complaint management functions. Based on the Irbansus functional position map, there are 10 employees consisting of PPUPD and Auditors at the Madya, Muda, and Pertama levels. When added up by level, the composition is 3 PPUPD and 7 Auditors. This number indicates that the complaint oversight function is carried out by limited resources, while complaints vary in substance and risk levels. These limitations make prioritization mechanisms a managerial necessity, not simply a technical option.

**Table 2. Map of Functional Positions of the Karawang Regency Inspectorate's Special Traffic Inspectorate**

No.	Functional Level/Position	PPUPD	Auditor	Total
1	Middle	2 persons	1 person	3 people
2	Young	0 people	5 people	5 people
3	First	1 person	1 person	2 persons
Amount		3 people	7 people	10 people

Source: Data from the Karawang Regency Inspectorate's Irbansus Employees, processed by researchers.

Staffing limitations don't necessarily mean all problems must be resolved through additional personnel. Workload is also influenced by the quality of initial data, duplication of reports, clarity of authority, design of verification flows, and the proportion of reports directed to audit. If reports lacking supervisory authority continue to absorb audit energy, organizational capacity will be depleted. Conversely, proper classification can increase effective capacity by allowing the organization to focus auditors and PPUPD on reports that truly require supervisory competence. In street-level bureaucracy theory, policy implementers often face limited resources, time pressures, and complex service demands. These conditions force them to exercise discretion in determining their response to incoming cases (Lipsky, 2010). Discretion need not be eliminated, as each complaint has a unique context. However, discretion needs to be guided through indicators, verification forms, tiered reviews, and documentation of decision rationales to prevent inconsistent decisions. Thus, the Inspectorate's primary need is not simply to expand channels or expedite disposition, but rather to develop a decision-making system that helps officers sort reports from the outset. A clear classification model can be instrumental in reducing unnecessary burdens, expediting responses to high-priority reports, and ensuring that incomplete complaints continue to receive data completion before being filed.

## Gap in Complaint Management Policy Implementation

Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 8 of 2023 places complaint classification as a crucial element in complaint management within local governments. The regulation distinguishes between supervisory complaints and non-

# INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

Kharisma Nourma Rani

supervisory complaints. This distinction is crucial because reports relating to alleged abuse of authority, regional losses, serious administrative violations, or indications of governmental irregularities cannot be treated the same as ordinary service complaints or information lacking preliminary evidence. In practice in Karawang Regency, complaints management has been carried out through report receipt, recording, disposition, and administrative follow-up. However, data findings indicate that this process is not fully supported by an operational classification that explains the relationship between complaint type, priority level, and form of follow-up. This gap can be referred to as an operational gap, namely a situation where regulations provide general direction, but the organization does not yet have a sufficiently detailed work tool to translate it into daily decisions.

From a policy implementation perspective, these gaps can be explained through Edwards III's four variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure (Edwards III, 1980). Communication relates to the extent to which implementers understand the definitions of supervisory and non-supervisory complaints. Resources relate to the availability of human resources, data, systems, and time for review. Disposition relates to implementers' orientation toward substantive report completion. Bureaucratic structure relates to standard operating procedures (SOPs), coordination flows, and decision-making authority. The most obvious gap lies in the interpretation of report status. An archived or administratively completed status can be valid if the report does not meet requirements, is outside of authority, lacks preliminary evidence, or has been delegated to the appropriate authority. However, this status must have a documented basis. Otherwise, archiving can raise public doubts about the quality of follow-up. Fadli (2025) points out that negative perceptions of complaint services can arise when responses are slow and report statuses are not transparent. This situation indicates that the complaints system requires a more detailed data language. Data cannot simply show the number of complaints received, the number completed, or the number archived. Data must also show the classification reason, priority level, verification method, relevant regional apparatus, follow-up deadlines, coordination results, and the basis for report closure. With a more robust data language, complaints can serve as an organizational learning tool, not simply an administrative archive.

## Complaints as an Instrument of Public Accountability and Oversight

Public complaints play a strategic role in strengthening public accountability. Accountability not only means the government submitting performance reports, but also the government's ability to explain and justify its actions to those authorized to assess them (Bovens, 2007). In the context of complaints, accountability requires ensuring that reports are received, verified, their authority assessed, follow-up actions decided upon, and the results explained to the complainant, provided they do not violate confidentiality regulations. Complaints also serve as a form of social control. Communities are often the first to learn about problems in the field, such as alleged extortion, misappropriation of village funds, project inconsistencies, maladministration, and social assistance issues. This information can serve as an early warning system for the Inspectorate. However, complaints are preliminary, not definitive, evidence. Their value as an oversight tool depends on the organization's ability to verify the substance, discern the quality of evidence, and determine whether reports require review, clarification, coordination, or data completion.

From the New Public Service perspective, citizens are not merely customers, but stakeholders in the public interest who need to be involved in the governance process (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). Therefore, complaints should not be viewed as a disruption to the bureaucracy. Complaints should be viewed as information that helps the government understand policy weaknesses, official behavior, and governance risks. The better complaints are processed, the greater the opportunity for local governments to improve services and prevent recurrence of problems. However, public participation must be balanced with a credible response system. If complaints are simply received and then closed without adequate explanation, public trust in official channels will erode. Conversely, if each report receives a clear status and a traceable decision, the public will see that complaints have governance consequences. Transparency does not necessarily require disclosing all details of the investigation, but at least providing understandable information regarding the stages, authority, reasons for follow-up, and the final status. Strengthening accountability for complaints is also related to network governance. Complaints often involve more than one regional apparatus, and can even involve the APIP, technical apparatus, complaint administrators, liaison officers, and regional leaders. Provan and Kenis (2008) explain that the effectiveness of an organizational network depends on its structure, roles, and coordination mechanisms. In complaint management, coordination is crucial so that reports outside the Inspectorate's jurisdiction are not stopped at disposition but are monitored until they receive a response from the appropriate regional apparatus.

# INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

Kharisma Nourma Rani

## Integrated Classification Model Based on Supervision Level and Eisenhower Matrix

The integrated classification model proposed in this article combines two decision bases. The first base is a normative classification based on Home Affairs Ministerial Regulation No. 8 of 2023, namely complaints with supervisory and non-supervisory levels. The second base is an operational classification based on the Eisenhower Matrix, namely mapping levels of importance and urgency. Combining these two bases is necessary for decisions to be not only legally valid but also managerially effective. The importance dimension in this model indicates the severity of the complaint for the Inspectorate's oversight function. The stronger the indications of abuse of authority, potential regional losses, widespread impacts on the community, governance violations, or links to the authority of the Internal Audit Agency (APIP), the higher the level of importance of the complaint. Meanwhile, the urgency dimension indicates the time required for a response. A complaint is considered urgent if there is a risk of evidence loss, ongoing conflict, potential ongoing losses, safety concerns, or a need for immediate prevention.

Through these two dimensions, reports can be placed into four priorities. Priority I is an important and urgent report with a high level of oversight. Priority II is an important but not urgent report, requiring clarification, coaching, a regular audit, or a follow-up examination. Priority III is an urgent report with a low level of oversight, requiring coordination with the technical regional apparatus. Priority IV is a report that is unclear, incomplete, or not within the Inspectorate's authority, requiring data completion or archiving with a clear reason. This model is not intended to replace the professional authority of the auditor or the PPUPD. Rather, it provides an initial framework for more consistent and reviewable review decisions. In supervisory practice, final decisions still require professional judgment, evidence, authority, and legal requirements. The matrix serves only as a tool to simplify the initial complexity so that organizations do not treat all reports with the same intensity.

**Table 3. Integrated Classification Model of Public Complaints**

Priorit y	Complaint Criteria	Category	Follow-up Form
I	Contains allegations of abuse of authority, extortion, regional losses, serious violations, ongoing conflicts, or the risk of evidence being lost.	Level of supervision; important and urgent.	Rapid review and verification, initial clarification, PDTT/special inspection if the elements are met, and coordination with APH/related agencies if necessary.
II	Relating to alleged administrative, governance, strategic service violations, or potential irregularities, but not requiring an immediate response.	Level of supervision; important but not urgent.	Scheduled for clarification, regular audit, coaching, follow-up inspection, or entry into the supervisory work plan.
III	It requires a quick response, but the substance is not the main authority of the Inspectorate or is more appropriately handled by the technical regional apparatus.	No level of supervision; less important for supervision but urgent.	Coordinated or delegated to the relevant regional apparatus accompanied by monitoring so that it does not stop at disposition.
IV	The object/subject is unclear, initial evidence is insufficient, beyond authority, or is general information that cannot be verified.	Cannot be determined or not subject to supervision; less important and less urgent.	Complete data is requested, recorded as monitoring material, or archived for documented reasons.

Source: Processed by researchers based on Home Affairs Ministerial Regulation Number 8 of 2023 and the Eisenhower Matrix.

The advantage of this model lies in its ability to expand follow-up options. Complaints tend to be focused on two ends: investigation or archiving. However, there are many forms of follow-up that fall between the two, such as requests for complete data, limited clarification, coordination with regional authorities, coaching, monitoring, or integration into thematic oversight agendas. By expanding follow-up options, organizations can respond to reports more proportionately.

# INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

Kharisma Nourma Rani

Classification models also help clarify performance indicators. Complaint indicators should not simply be the percentage of complaints resolved. Indicators should include initial response time, verification time, proportion of reports per priority, percentage of reports returned for completeness, percentage of follow-up by local government agencies, number of repeat reports, and proportion of recommendations acted upon. Indicators like these encourage organizations to measure the quality of the response, not just the speed of closure. Within the framework of policy implementation, this model can bridge the gap between regulation and practice. While Home Affairs Ministerial Regulation No. 8 of 2023 provides the basis for classification, organizations need a working tool that can be used by administrators, liaison officers, auditors, PPUPDs, and leaders. A priority matrix facilitates policy communication because all actors share the same guidelines regarding what constitutes important, urgent, and subject to oversight.

Implementing the model requires several prerequisites. First, an initial verification form must contain the identity of the complainant, the object of the complaint, the subject of the complaint, initial evidence, authority, risk, and response time requirements. Second, a status dictionary must be created that distinguishes between received, verified, requested for completion, delegated, coordinated, reviewed, substantively completed, and archived. Third, regular reviews of classification decisions must be conducted to correct misclassifications. Fourth, a simple dashboard must be created that displays the workload and follow-up status per channel. Strengthening human resource capacity must also be role-based. Complaint administrators need to understand initial verification and communication of report status. Liaison officers need to understand cross-regional coordination and deadline management. Auditors and the Regional Public Prosecutor's Office (PPUPD) need to strengthen risk assessments, evidence tracking, and documentation of audit rationales. Leaders need aggregated information to prioritize oversight and evaluate regional agencies that repeatedly receive complaints.

In terms of transparency, this model can improve communication with reporters. Reporters don't always have to receive all the audit information, but they can be provided with explanations regarding the report's status, ongoing stages, reasons for delegating the report, data requirements, and the basis for filing. This clarity is important because unproven complaints can still be used for monitoring, while incomplete complaints can be further developed if the reporter adds evidence. Based on the overall findings, public complaint management at the Karawang Regency Inspectorate has an institutional foundation in place, consisting of a receipt channel, a regulatory framework, and a supervisory unit that handles complaints. However, this foundation is insufficient without a decision architecture that explains how reports are sorted, prioritized, followed up, and closed. In other words, complaints have an entry point, but they still require a roadmap after they are received.

The finding of a high proportion of filings requires a critical examination. Filing is not always a problem, as complaints may not meet audit requirements. However, overly broad filing categories can obscure the reasons for closure and compromise accountability. Therefore, improvements should not be directed at eliminating filing status, but rather at clarifying the basis, differentiating closure types, providing opportunities for data completion, and ensuring that recurring or patterned reports remain subject to oversight evaluation. Academically, the proposed model connects policy implementation theory with operational prioritization instruments. Implementation theory helps explain why regulations have not automatically resulted in practice changes, while the Eisenhower Matrix helps translate resource constraints into priority decisions. This integration is crucial because complaints policy requires a balance between adherence to norms, the use of professional discretion, resource efficiency, and accountability to the public.

In practice, the classification model can serve as the basis for developing standard operating procedures (SOPs) for complaint management at the Karawang Regency Inspectorate. These SOPs should include operational definitions of complaint types, indicators of importance and urgency, review deadlines, verification formats, regional government coordination mechanisms, communication standards for complainants, and aggregate reporting formats. If implemented consistently, this model can strengthen oversight, expedite responses to high-priority reports, and prevent complaints from being lost in the administrative process. Thus, public complaints need to be considered a governance asset. Complaints provide information not always visible through routine audits, regional apparatus reports, or service indicators. When managed and classified appropriately, complaints can serve as an early warning system, a source for setting monitoring priorities, an instrument for social control, and a learning tool for policy. Conversely, if simply recorded and suppressed, local governments lose the opportunity to address problems before they recur.

## CONCLUSION

Public complaint management at the Karawang Regency Inspectorate has an institutional basis through the existence of a complaint channel, report recording, and the role of the Irbansus (Special Inspectorate) in its oversight function. However, its implementation still faces challenges in the classification, prioritization, and transparency of

# INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE

Kharisma Nourma Rani

follow-up. Data from 2023-2025 shows that of 130 complaints, only 15, or 11.5%, were followed up through PDTT (Regional Public Information and Communication), while 115 complaints, or 88.5%, ended up as archives or administrative settlements. This situation indicates the need for a more detailed interpretation of report status to ensure that administrative settlements do not overshadow the need for substantive resolution. The proposed integrated classification model combines normative classification based on oversight level with operational priorities based on the Eisenhower Matrix. This model divides complaints into four priorities: important and urgent, important but not urgent, urgent but less important for the oversight function, and not urgent and not yet important enough to warrant action. This division helps the Inspectorate determine whether a report needs to be reviewed, scheduled, coordinated, requested for completion, or archived for a clear reason. This article recommends that the Karawang Regency Inspectorate develop standard operating procedures (SOPs) for complaint classification, initial verification forms, a report status dictionary, a monitoring dashboard, and a periodic review forum. These enhancements are crucial to ensure that complaints are not merely received as administrative obligations but are processed as a source of oversight information and material for improving regional governance. Further research could test this model through implementation studies after a period of implementation.

## REFERENCES

- Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447-468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x>
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). *The new public service: Serving, not steering* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Fadli, F. (2025). Respons publik terhadap layanan pengaduan SP4N LAPOR!: Analisis sentimen multi-platform. *Jurnal Audiens*, 6(2), 295-311. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jas.v6i2.616>
- Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia. (2023). Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 8 Tahun 2023 tentang Pengelolaan Pengaduan di Lingkungan Kementerian Dalam Negeri dan Pemerintahan Daerah.
- Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Republik Indonesia. (2020). Peraturan Menteri PANRB Nomor 46 Tahun 2020 tentang Road Map Sistem Pengelolaan Pengaduan Pelayanan Publik Nasional Tahun 2020-2024.
- Kurniawan MZ, D., Syafri, W., & Amalia, R. (2024). Efektivitas penyelesaian pengaduan masyarakat melalui aplikasi Layanan Aspirasi Pengaduan Online Rakyat (LAPOR) di lingkungan Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Pemerintah: Journal of Government, Social and Politics*, 10(1). [https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2024.vol10\(1\).16959](https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2024.vol10(1).16959)
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services* (30th anniversary expanded ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott, Foresman.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Muttaqin, M., & Pusvita, V. (2023). A decade of LAPOR: Usage trends of SP4N service channels. *Jurnal Pekommas*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.56873/jpkm.v8i1.5138>
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Karawang. (2022). Peraturan Bupati Karawang Nomor 68 Tahun 2022 tentang Pengelolaan Pengaduan Pelayanan Publik di Lingkungan Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Karawang.
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2009). Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik.
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2013). Peraturan Presiden Nomor 76 Tahun 2013 tentang Pengelolaan Pengaduan Pelayanan Publik.
- Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229-252. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015>
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445-488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404>
- Wulandari, S. (2023). Improving the quality of public services through the SP4N-LAPOR! complaint application at the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Bhakti Praja*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.33701/jiwbp.v13i2.3627>

**INTEGRATED CLASSIFICATION MODEL IN PUBLIC COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT IN THE KARAWANG DISTRICT INSPECTORATE**

Kharisma Nourma Rani

---

Yahya, A. S., & Setiyono, S. (2022). Efektivitas pelayanan publik melalui sistem pengelolaan pengaduan aplikasi SP4N-LAPOR. *Jurnal Media Birokrasi*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.33701/jmb.v4i1.2432>