

**Vespera Acta Academica (VAA)**
Vol 1 No 1 November 2026, Hal 45-58
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (Print) ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (Electronic)
Open Access: https://researchfrontiers.id/vaa

# Administrative Accountability and Citizen Complaint Management in Digital Public Services

**Syalaisha Renaisse Fathiha**[1]
[1] Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Sukoharjo, Indonesia
*email: Syalaisharee77@gmail.com*

**Article Info :**
Received:
02-10-2026
Revised:
27-10-2026
Accepted:
10-11-2026

***Abstract***

*Digital complaint platforms have expanded opportunities for citizens to report public service failures, yet accessible reporting channels do not necessarily establish administrative accountability. This study examined the relationship between complaint management procedures and institutional responsibility within Indonesia's SP4N-LAPOR! system. A qualitative documentary case-study approach analyzed publicly available platform guidance, government service descriptions, and published local implementation research. The analysis distinguished complaint submission, verification, institutional routing, follow-up, communication, and closure while comparing evidence on participation, responsiveness, and coordination. Findings indicate that procedural visibility and timely acknowledgment should not be equated with justified decisions or substantive correction. Published local studies address different administrative settings and evaluation criteria, limiting conclusions about national performance. The analysis also identified the potential contribution of complaint data to institutional learning, alongside limitations arising from unequal participation and automated classification. An integrated accountability framework was formulated around accessibility, traceability, answerability, responsiveness, resolution, citizen feedback, and organizational learning. The framework offers documentary indicators for assessing institutional obligations across successive complaint stages. No individual case files, interviews, or independently verified nationwide statistics were available, and the framework was not empirically validated. Future research should test its indicators against complaint histories, administrative decisions, and citizen-reported outcomes to assess accountability in practice.*

***Keywords:*** *Administrative Accountability, Citizen Complaint Management, Digital Governance, Public Service Delivery, SP4N-LAPOR!.*

©2026 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

## INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has altered the institutional mechanisms through which governments receive public demands, communicate administrative decisions, and respond to deficiencies in service delivery. The integration of digital technologies into public administration has expanded opportunities for information exchange while introducing new questions concerning transparency, responsibility, and the organizational consequences of digitally mediated interactions (Agostino et al., 2022). Citizen complaint platforms have become increasingly relevant because they provide formal channels through which individuals can report service failures, request administrative clarification, and seek corrective action from public institutions. Research examining digital governance in Indonesia highlights the relationship between public organizational arrangements, transparency, and accountability as interconnected dimensions of government performance (Pribadi et al., 2024). The effectiveness of complaint mechanisms nevertheless depends on institutional responsiveness rather than the technological availability of reporting channels alone. Comparative research on electronic government services identifies economic, social, and political conditions as relevant to understanding variations in citizen complaints and interactions with public authorities (Sebő & Bel, 2024). Grievance redress scholarship further positions complaint management within broader relationships involving administrative power, citizen participation, and the capacity of public institutions to respond meaningfully to expressed concerns (Hossain et al., 2024).

Contemporary research on digital complaint management has developed along several complementary directions involving service responsiveness, institutional coordination, operational procedures, and improvements in administrative processes. Evaluations of complaint handling in digital public services emphasize the relevance of response performance and compliance with established operational procedures when assessing the quality of administrative follow-up (Fattah et al., 2026).

Research examining the implementation of digital complaint services identifies operational challenges that require attention beyond the availability of electronic reporting facilities (Indrayani et al., 2025). Studies of local digital governance further demonstrate the analytical importance of stakeholder relationships in understanding how complaint management systems operate within public organizations (Handrian et al., 2025). Qualitative investigations of public sector complaint handling provide complementary evidence concerning the organizational processes through which service improvements may be identified and implemented (Prasasti et al., 2025). These research directions indicate that effective complaint management involves an interconnected sequence of reporting, administrative coordination, response formulation, and service improvement rather than a single technological transaction.

Despite these developments, the relationship between digital complaint processing and demonstrable administrative accountability remains insufficiently integrated across the available research approaches. Investigations of electronic participation indicate that the existence of digital complaint services does not necessarily produce sustained citizen engagement, as illustrated by research concerning participation challenges within a local government complaint platform (Yaniar & Fatkhuri, 2023). Studies of bureaucratic responsiveness further establish the relevance of examining how public institutions address citizen information requests, including the administrative conditions surrounding response provision (Trautendorfer et al., 2024). Research identifying determinants of citizen complaints contributes an explanation of variation in public reporting behavior but addresses a different analytical question from whether submitted complaints generate accountable administrative outcomes (Sebő & Bel, 2024). Scholarship on grievance redress mechanisms also highlights the political and institutional dimensions of complaint management, suggesting that procedural availability cannot independently establish equitable administrative treatment (Hossain et al., 2024). These contributions illuminate important components of digital complaint governance, yet their differing research emphases leave the relationship between complaint accessibility, institutional responsibility, substantive resolution, and organizational learning insufficiently consolidated. The resulting research gap concerns the absence of an integrated analytical account within the selected literature of how successive complaint-handling stages can be evaluated as connected dimensions of administrative accountability rather than independent indicators of digital service performance.

The distinction between procedural complaint processing and substantive administrative responsibility has significant implications for the credibility of digital government institutions. Evaluations emphasizing responsiveness and procedural compliance demonstrate the relevance of assessing whether administrative responses conform to established service requirements, although procedural completion must be distinguished analytically from the adequacy of corrective action (Fattah et al., 2026). Implementation-oriented research on local complaint services provides a basis for examining how operational difficulties can affect the continuity and effectiveness of digital public service delivery (Indrayani et al., 2025). Institutional transparency and accountability also require attention to organizational arrangements because information disclosure alone does not explain how responsibility is allocated among administrative actors (Pribadi et al., 2024). Research on public sector digitalization reinforces the need to consider accountability as an organizational and managerial concern rather than a purely technological consequence of digital transformation (Agostino et al., 2022). Without a coherent analytical connection between complaint registration, administrative assignment, follow-up, resolution, and institutional evaluation, governments may have difficulty distinguishing completed digital procedures from meaningful responses to citizens' concerns.

The present study positions citizen complaint management as an administrative accountability process that extends from the submission of grievances to institutional explanation, corrective action, and organizational learning. Existing qualitative research on public sector complaint improvement contributes valuable operational perspectives but does not independently provide a comprehensive accountability framework applicable to every stage of digitally mediated complaint handling (Prasasti et al., 2025). Stakeholder-oriented investigations of local complaint governance demonstrate the importance of institutional relationships, while leaving scope for further conceptual integration between actor responsibilities and the administrative consequences of complaint resolution (Handrian et al., 2025). Evidence concerning limited electronic participation also indicates that citizen engagement should be distinguished from the subsequent capacity of public institutions to manage and resolve submitted complaints (Yaniar & Fatkhuri, 2023). Research on bureaucratic responsiveness provides an

additional conceptual foundation for examining how governmental replies relate to administrative answerability and the treatment of citizen requests (Trautendorfer et al., 2024). Building upon these contributions, the proposed novelty consists of an integrated documentary framework that distinguishes digital accessibility, administrative answerability, substantive complaint resolution, and institutional learning as interdependent but separately assessable dimensions of accountability. The framework places Indonesia's SP4N-LAPOR! complaint-management architecture within a comparative analytical structure informed by published local implementation studies, without assuming that the availability of a formal workflow establishes its operational effectiveness.

This study aims to examine the relationship between administrative accountability and citizen complaint management in digital public services through a structured analysis of publicly available institutional documentation and relevant scholarly literature. The investigation specifically seeks to identify the administrative responsibilities associated with complaint submission, verification, institutional assignment, response formulation, resolution, and subsequent evaluation. It also aims to interpret documented challenges involving citizen participation, institutional coordination, procedural responsiveness, and the transparency of complaint-handling outcomes. The analytical framework distinguishes procedural accessibility from administrative answerability, substantive corrective action, and the institutional capacity to incorporate citizen complaints into service improvement. The study is intended to contribute to public administration scholarship by clarifying the relationships between digital complaint mechanisms and the organizational obligations that constitute accountable government service delivery. Its practical contribution lies in establishing an evidence-oriented basis for assessing complaint management procedures and identifying governance requirements that may strengthen transparency, institutional responsibility, citizen responsiveness, and administrative learning within digital public services.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative documentary case-study approach to examine administrative accountability and citizen complaint management within Indonesia's SP4N-LAPOR! digital public service system. The investigation was bounded to the national platform's publicly documented administrative procedures rather than individual complaint cases or directly observed institutional operations. Primary documentary sources comprised the official public complaint portal and its published descriptions of complaint submission, verification, administrative processing, and reporting procedures (LAPOR!, 2026). Additional institutional materials included government service guidance explaining the operational structure, reporting channels, and administrative responsibilities associated with digital complaint management (Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs, 2026b). Supporting scholarly publications provided contextual evidence from previously documented local government implementations and evaluations of public complaint services, allowing distinctions between formal administrative arrangements and reported operational practices. The unit of analysis consisted of documented complaint-handling stages and institutional responsibilities, with documentary examination directed toward accessibility, administrative assignment, response obligations, communication procedures, complaint closure, and feedback mechanisms.

Documentary analysis was organized through a stage-oriented thematic framework encompassing digital accessibility, procedural traceability, institutional responsiveness, administrative fairness, and organizational learning. Official institutional descriptions were interpreted as evidence of formally established procedures, whereas published empirical investigations were treated as secondary accounts of implementation within their respective administrative settings. Previous research concerning SP4N-LAPOR! complaint management provided contextual material for examining procedural follow-up, administrative coordination, and operational constraints in local government services (Marrisca & Prastyawan, 2024). Research addressing public information disclosure and service quality contributed an additional analytical basis for interpreting transparency, communication, and citizen-oriented dimensions of digital complaint handling (Irianto et al., 2025). Analytical credibility was maintained by distinguishing documented institutional requirements from previously reported findings, preserving differences between local implementation accounts, and avoiding unsupported generalizations about national complaint-resolution performance. The investigation did not involve interviews, direct observation, access to protected complaint records, or independent verification of

nationwide administrative statistics; consequently, its conclusions were restricted to the documentary evidence and published studies available for qualitative interpretation.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Digital Complaint Intake and Procedural Traceability in Administrative Accountability

Digital complaint management establishes a formal interface through which citizens can communicate administrative problems and request responses from public authorities. Indonesia's SP4N-LAPOR! system provides a national reporting mechanism intended to facilitate the submission and management of public complaints and aspirations through an integrated digital platform (LAPOR!, 2026). Government service documentation describes the platform as a mechanism connecting public reporting activities with the administrative institutions responsible for addressing submitted issues (Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs, 2026b). The existence of this infrastructure creates opportunities for recording interactions that would otherwise depend on fragmented communication channels and institution-specific procedures. Research on digitalization and public-sector accountability emphasizes that technological transformation changes how administrative information, institutional responsibilities, and public oversight are organized (Agostino et al., 2022). Nevertheless, the availability of electronic reporting facilities does not independently establish whether individual complaints receive adequate institutional consideration or substantive resolution. The documentary analysis consequently distinguishes digital accessibility from administrative accountability by examining the responsibilities associated with successive stages of the complaint management process.

Accessibility represents the initial condition for citizen participation in digital complaint mechanisms because reporting procedures must be understandable and available to individuals with different administrative and technological capabilities. Publicly available guidance concerning SP4N-LAPOR! provides information on complaint submission procedures and the operation of digital reporting channels (Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs, 2026a). The practical effectiveness of these channels remains dependent on citizens' awareness of the service, their ability to formulate complaints, and their willingness to engage with public institutions. Research concerning limited electronic participation in the Bekasi Nyambung Bae complaint service illustrates the relevance of examining participation barriers within local digital governance arrangements (Yaniar & Fatkhuri, 2023). Comparative research on electronic government and citizen complaints similarly indicates that complaint behavior should be interpreted alongside the economic, social, and political characteristics of service environments (Sebő & Bel, 2024). These considerations suggest that complaint submission totals cannot independently establish either the accessibility of a reporting system or the quality of the public services being evaluated.

Administrative verification constitutes a distinct stage of complaint processing because submitted information must be examined before an institution can determine the appropriate response. The SP4N-LAPOR! public interface presents complaint management as a sequence involving submission, verification, follow-up, and subsequent communication with the reporting citizen (LAPOR!, 2026). Verification may require clarification of reported circumstances, examination of supporting information, and identification of the administrative authority responsible for the issue. Institutional reporting concerning the implementation of SP4N-LAPOR! provides documentary material relevant to understanding how formal complaint management procedures are situated within government administration (Ministry of Environment, 2026). Evaluation of complaint handling performance in the Jogja Smart Service further establishes procedural compliance and responsiveness as relevant dimensions of administrative service assessment (Fattah et al., 2026). The analytical distinction between verification and substantive resolution is important because acceptance of a report does not demonstrate that the underlying administrative problem has been corrected. Reliable procedural evaluation must consequently distinguish the completeness of submitted information, the legitimacy of verification decisions, and the justification provided for subsequent administrative actions.

Institutional routing determines which public authority assumes responsibility for examining and resolving a complaint after its initial administrative assessment. Stakeholder-oriented research on digital complaint governance in Pekanbaru identifies institutional relationships as an important dimension of evaluating local complaint management systems (Handrian et al., 2025). Investigations of online complaint management through SP4N-LAPOR! provide additional evidence concerning the

administrative arrangements through which citizen reports are handled within public service institutions (Zein et al., 2025). Research examining public aspirations and complaints across three Indonesian provinces extends this concern to the relationship between citizen input and institutional decision-making (Ibty et al., 2025). These contributions indicate that the allocation of administrative responsibility requires attention to jurisdiction, coordination, and the continuity of communication throughout complaint processing. A technically successful transfer between institutions cannot be interpreted as accountable handling unless the responsible authority remains identifiable and the subsequent administrative decision can be examined. Table 1 presents the documentary accountability framework derived from the publicly described complaint process and the corresponding requirements for procedural evaluation.

**Table 1. Documentary Framework for Evaluating Procedural Traceability in Digital Complaint Management**

| Omplaint Management Stage | Administrative Responsibility | Documentary Evidence Required For Evaluation | Potential Accountability Concern |
|---|---|---|---|
| Complaint submission | Facilitate reporting and acknowledge receipt | Reporting channel, submission record, acknowledgment | Limited accessibility or unclear reporting procedures |
| Initial verification | Examine complaint information and administrative relevance | Verification status, decision rationale, supporting information | Unexplained rejection or prolonged verification |
| Institutional routing | Identify and assign the responsible government institution | Assignment record, transfer history, responsible unit | Unclear jurisdiction or fragmented responsibility |
| Administrative follow-up | Examine the reported issue and determine appropriate action | Response documentation, action description, decision record | Procedural response without substantive examination |
| Citizen communication | Explain administrative progress and decisions | Notification history, response explanation, communication record | Inadequate information or uncertain complaint status |
| Complaint closure | Record disposition and relevant follow-up | Closure rationale, documented action, available feedback | Closure without demonstrable corrective action |

Table 1 separates complaint management into identifiable administrative stages rather than interpreting the digital reporting mechanism as a single undifferentiated service. The framework indicates that each stage creates a different accountability question concerning access, verification, responsibility, administrative action, communication, or closure. Official SP4N-LAPOR! documentation provides the procedural foundation for identifying these stages, although publicly described workflows cannot establish the quality of every completed complaint (LAPOR!, 2026). Local research concerning electronic complaint services in Badung Regency demonstrates the relevance of examining implementation arrangements within particular government jurisdictions (Pradnyawati & Widhi Antari, 2024). Investigations connecting electronic government and anti-corruption mechanisms further support consideration of transparency and institutional oversight when assessing complaint administration (Kirana & Humaira, 2025). The analytical value of procedural traceability lies in identifying where responsibility should be documented and where a complaint may lose administrative continuity. Such distinctions permit more precise examination of reported implementation problems without attributing undocumented failures to the national complaint system.

Transparency represents another accountability requirement because citizens must be able to understand the administrative status of their reports and the institutional reasoning underlying official responses. Research concerning digital governance in Indonesia identifies transparency and accountability as related characteristics of public organizational arrangements (Pribadi et al., 2024).

Scholarship addressing electronic government transformation similarly places transparency and accountability among the institutional objectives associated with digital public service development (Sabarofek et al., 2024). Information disclosure should nevertheless be distinguished from meaningful explanation because the publication of a processing status may provide limited information about the substance of an administrative decision. Investigations applying the E-GovQual model to SP4N-LAPOR! emphasize the relevance of service quality and public information disclosure in assessing digital complaint services (Irianto et al., 2025). An accountable communication process requires the relationship between reported problems, institutional decisions, and subsequent actions to remain intelligible to the complainant. Documentary evaluation should accordingly examine the clarity of published procedures and response obligations without assuming that transparency is achieved merely through technological visibility.

Technical developments in complaint processing introduce additional considerations concerning the organization and interpretation of citizen reports. Research on artificial intelligence-driven complaint classification in Karanganyar illustrates the use of computational methods to support categorization within public service reporting systems (Al Amin et al., 2025). Investigations of entity extraction from electronic government complaint data similarly demonstrate the relevance of automated text analysis to identifying information within unstructured administrative submissions (Umam et al., 2025). Machine learning approaches addressing class imbalance in public complaint classification introduce questions about whether automated categorization adequately represents complaints with different frequencies or characteristics (Zahro et al., 2025). Research on attention-based classification of citizen requests further extends this technological development to government–citizen communication systems (Zhang et al., 2025). These applications may support administrative organization, although their use does not independently establish appropriate complaint routing or substantive institutional responsiveness. Automated classification should therefore be treated as a potential administrative support function whose outputs remain subject to accountable institutional examination and correction.

Procedural traceability provides an analytical basis for identifying administrative obligations but does not constitute direct evidence of complaint resolution performance. Research investigating bureaucratic responsiveness demonstrates why official responses must be evaluated according to the information and administrative consideration they provide rather than their existence alone (Trautendorfer et al., 2024). Grievance redress scholarship further emphasizes that complaint mechanisms operate within institutional and political relationships affecting how citizens engage with public authorities (Hossain et al., 2024). These concerns suggest that the accountability value of an administrative workflow depends on the relationship between formal procedures and their actual implementation. Digital transformation research also cautions against reducing public accountability to the adoption of new technologies or the production of additional administrative information (Agostino et al., 2022). The documentary evidence examined here permits identification of potential accountability checkpoints but does not support calculation of national compliance rates or conclusions about individual unresolved complaints. Comparative examination of published local implementation studies is therefore necessary to interpret how administrative responsibilities may operate under different institutional conditions.

## Institutional Responsiveness and Implementation Challenges in Digital Citizen Complaint Management

Local government experiences provide an important comparative basis for examining how formal digital complaint procedures interact with institutional capacity and administrative practice. Research on SP4N-LAPOR! implementation in Gresik addresses the management of public complaints as part of efforts to improve public service delivery (Marrisca & Prastyawan, 2024). Studies of public information disclosure through SP4N-LAPOR! provide a complementary perspective by emphasizing service quality and the informational dimensions of government–citizen interaction (Irianto et al., 2025). Research on Lapak Aduan implementation introduces another institutional setting in which the challenges of digital public service delivery can be examined (Indrayani et al., 2025). The selected studies differ in administrative setting, analytical emphasis, and the aspects of complaint management receiving primary attention. Their findings cannot be combined into a single performance estimate without comparable operational definitions and directly available administrative records. Comparative

interpretation is nevertheless useful for identifying the categories of institutional difficulty that warrant consideration when assessing digital complaint management.

Administrative responsiveness involves more than responding quickly because the adequacy of an official reply also depends on its relevance, completeness, and relationship to the citizen's reported problem. Public sentiment analysis concerning SP4N-LAPOR! provides a basis for examining how users evaluate the responsiveness and communication characteristics of complaint services (Fadli, 2025). Research assessing national online aspiration and complaint services similarly positions service quality as a relevant component of evaluating government reporting mechanisms (Suwardi & Pramono, 2025). Evaluations of the Jogja Smart Service emphasize responsiveness and standard operating procedure compliance, illustrating the importance of relating complaint handling to established administrative requirements (Fattah et al., 2026). These perspectives distinguish citizens' perceptions of service quality from documentary evidence concerning whether an institution completed its assigned responsibilities. Dissatisfaction expressed through online comments may indicate communication problems but cannot independently establish the procedural history of every complaint. A rigorous accountability assessment must consequently differentiate perceived responsiveness, procedural timeliness, and the substantive adequacy of administrative action.

Organizational capacity affects the relationship between complaint reception and subsequent resolution because different institutions possess varying resources, responsibilities, and administrative arrangements. Qualitative research on public sector complaint handling provides a methodological foundation for examining how organizational procedures influence the improvement of complaint management services (Prasasti et al., 2025). Stakeholder analysis of Pekanbaru's digital governance highlights the relevance of interorganizational relationships when evaluating complaint management arrangements (Handrian et al., 2025). Investigations of SP4N-LAPOR! implementation within public services provide further context for examining administrative coordination and operational responsibilities (Zein et al., 2025). The underlying institutional challenge concerns the extent to which formal assignment of a complaint corresponds to an identifiable obligation to examine, communicate, and resolve the reported issue. Fragmented responsibility may complicate follow-up when a complaint concerns more than one government unit or requires coordination across administrative boundaries. The documentary comparison identifies coordination as an important evaluative dimension without claiming to establish the frequency or causal effects of such difficulties across Indonesian government institutions.

Formal regulatory arrangements provide a separate perspective on the implementation of complaint management because institutional responsibilities must be interpreted in relation to applicable administrative procedures. Research addressing SP4N-LAPOR! implementation in Kampar Regency examines the local application of the system with reference to contemporary public complaint management regulation (Azzahra et al., 2026). Studies concerning public aspirations and complaints across three provinces introduce a broader comparative setting for assessing the relationship between citizen reporting and government decision-making (Ibty et al., 2025). Institutional reporting on SP4N-LAPOR! supplies an additional documentary reference concerning the administration of complaint services within a government organization (Ministry of Environment, 2026). These sources address different levels of administrative activity and should not be treated as equivalent evidence of regulatory compliance or service outcomes. Regulatory conformity, administrative responsiveness, and citizen satisfaction represent analytically distinct criteria that require different forms of documentation. Table 2 organizes the published local studies according to their principal analytical emphasis and the limits of the conclusions that can be drawn from them.

**Table 2. Comparative Mapping of Published Research on Digital Complaint Management in Indonesian Public Services**

| Published Study Or Setting | Principal Analytical Focus | Relevant Accountability Dimension | Evidence Limitation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gresik SP4N-LAPOR! (Marrisca & Prastyawan, 2024) | Complaint management and service improvement | Administrative follow-up and service effectiveness | Local implementation study |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| SP4N-LAPOR! and E-GovQual (Irianto et al., 2025) | Public information disclosure and service quality | Transparency and citizen-oriented communication | Service quality evaluation |
| Lapak Aduan (Indrayani et al., 2025) | Challenges of digital complaint service implementation | Organizational implementation and service continuity | Platform-specific setting |
| Jogja Smart Service (Fattah et al., 2026) | Responsiveness and procedural compliance | Timeliness and administrative conformity | Local complaint service evaluation |
| Pekanbaru (Handrian et al., 2025) | Stakeholder dynamics in digital governance | Institutional coordination and responsibility | Local governance setting |
| Kampar Regency (Azzahra et al., 2026) | Implementation of SP4N-LAPOR! in relation to regulation | Procedural and institutional compliance | Jurisdiction-specific analysis |
| Bekasi Nyambung Bae (Yaniar & Fatkhuri, 2023) | Citizen electronic participation | Accessibility and public engagement | Local participation study |
| Three Indonesian provinces (Ibty et al., 2025) | Public aspirations, complaints, and decision-making | Administrative use of citizen feedback | Selected provincial settings |

Table 2 demonstrates the diversity of approaches used to examine digital complaint management across Indonesian public institutions. Research concerning electronic complaint services in Badung Regency adds a local implementation perspective to the broader analysis of digital government procedures (Pradnyawati & Widhi Antari, 2024). A review of electronic government implementation in Indonesian complaint services also provides a basis for considering how platform arrangements differ across administrative settings (Yunita et al., 2024). Variation in electronic participation, illustrated by research on Bekasi Nyambung Bae, introduces an additional dimension that cannot be reduced to institutional response performance (Yaniar & Fatkhuri, 2023). A reporting platform may provide formal administrative procedures while still encountering barriers to citizen engagement or uncertainty concerning institutional follow-up. The comparative evidence supports separating participation, responsiveness, procedural conformity, and service improvement as distinct analytical dimensions. This classification avoids assigning unsupported relative performance rankings to local governments studied through different research designs.

Citizen feedback introduces an additional governance relationship because public complaints can influence administrative behavior beyond the handling of individual cases. Experimental research examining citizen feedback and public service motivation provides a basis for considering the relationship between public responses and the behavioral orientation of public employees (Pratama et al., 2025). Research on electronic government and citizen complaints further indicates that institutional environments and broader social conditions influence patterns of interaction between citizens and public authorities (Sebő & Bel, 2024). Investigations of street-level bureaucratic responses to citizens' voices illustrate the importance of examining the conditions under which administrative personnel prioritize public concerns (Zhao et al., 2025). These contributions suggest that responsiveness is partly an organizational phenomenon involving professional judgment, administrative incentives, and institutional expectations. The receipt of complaints does not automatically generate corrective behavior if institutional procedures fail to connect citizen feedback with accountable decisions. Evaluating complaint management consequently requires attention to how reported concerns enter administrative priorities and whether those priorities are reflected in documented follow-up.

Digital complaint records may also support the identification of recurring service problems through systematic analysis of textual and administrative information. Research using spatial and temporal approaches to online environmental complaints demonstrates how citizen reporting data can contribute to the interpretation of public management problems (Jiao et al., 2024). Entity extraction techniques applied to electronic government complaint data illustrate the possibility of identifying structured information from narrative submissions (Umam et al., 2025). Automated classification approaches for government–citizen requests similarly provide methodological examples of organizing

large collections of public reports into interpretable categories (Zhang et al., 2025). The administrative value of these techniques depends on whether the resulting classifications support meaningful institutional decisions rather than merely improving the technical organization of stored complaints. Recurrent issue categories may indicate potential service problems, although their interpretation requires attention to reporting access, classification accuracy, and the possibility of uneven participation among citizens. Documentary analysis supports recognizing such approaches as potential tools for institutional learning but does not establish their operational effectiveness within SP4N-LAPOR! without direct system-level evidence.

Institutional comparisons also expose the limits of interpreting complaint handling through isolated satisfaction indicators or descriptive implementation accounts. Grievance redress research emphasizes the institutional and political conditions that influence the relationship between citizens and the authorities responsible for responding to complaints (Hossain et al., 2024). Studies of bureaucratic responsiveness identify the administrative treatment of citizen requests as a distinct concern requiring attention to how authorities formulate and communicate responses (Trautendorfer et al., 2024). Research on transparency and accountability in Indonesian digital governance extends this concern to the organizational structures through which public institutions become answerable for administrative decisions (Pribadi et al., 2024). Local studies provide contextual information but employ different analytical units, research procedures, and standards for interpreting institutional performance. Their findings cannot establish a nationally representative account of complaint resolution or administrative compliance without additional comparable evidence. The resulting synthesis identifies a need for an accountability framework that connects citizen participation and complaint processing with substantive administrative action and organizational learning.

**Administrative Accountability, Complaint Resolution, and Institutional Learning in Digital Public Services**

Administrative accountability requires public institutions to explain their decisions, demonstrate the exercise of assigned responsibilities, and remain answerable for the consequences of administrative action. Digitalization changes the technical conditions under which these obligations are recorded and communicated but does not eliminate their organizational foundations (Agostino et al., 2022). Research concerning transparency and accountability in Indonesian digital governance provides an analytical basis for examining how organizational arrangements shape digitally mediated public administration (Pribadi et al., 2024). Studies addressing electronic government transformation similarly associate digital public services with institutional objectives involving transparency and responsible administrative performance (Sabarofek et al., 2024). These contributions support interpreting complaint management as an accountability mechanism rather than exclusively as a service application designed to receive citizen messages. Administrative performance must be evaluated through the relationship between reported grievances, responsible institutions, documented decisions, and the corrective actions undertaken. The central evaluative question concerns whether digital complaint processes enable public authorities to provide sufficiently traceable and substantively justified responses to citizens.

The SP4N-LAPOR! architecture provides a documentary basis for identifying the stages through which complaint-related responsibilities may be examined. Government service documentation describes the system as a digital channel for public complaints and aspirations involving relevant administrative institutions (Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs, 2026b). The public reporting portal presents a structured mechanism through which citizens may submit reports and receive information concerning subsequent handling processes (LAPOR!, 2026). Accountability evaluation must distinguish these formally described procedures from the actual adequacy of administrative responses within particular cases. Research discussing electronic government and anti-corruption through online complaint mechanisms highlights the broader governance relevance of public reporting facilities (Kirana & Humaira, 2025). A recorded complaint status may demonstrate that a procedural activity occurred but does not necessarily establish whether an administrative problem was corrected. The substantive assessment of accountability requires additional evidence concerning decision rationale, responsible authority, remedial action, and the communication of outcomes to the complainant.

Responsiveness represents an operational expression of accountability because administrative institutions must address reported concerns within procedures appropriate to their authority and public

service obligations. Qualitative research on public sector complaint handling provides a relevant basis for examining how procedural arrangements can be assessed and improved within government organizations (Prasasti et al., 2025). Evaluation of complaint handling in the Jogja Smart Service identifies responsiveness and standard operating procedure compliance as important dimensions of institutional service performance (Fattah et al., 2026). Research assessing the quality of online public complaint services further demonstrates the relevance of citizen-oriented service evaluation to understanding administrative performance (Suwardi & Pramono, 2025). These perspectives indicate that responsiveness should not be interpreted exclusively through the speed of an initial acknowledgment. A defensible assessment must distinguish acknowledgment, substantive investigation, administrative disposition, and communication of the decision. The proposed analytical framework consequently treats procedural timeliness and substantive resolution as related but independently assessable requirements.

Citizen complaints also provide a potential source of organizational learning when information about recurring service problems is incorporated into administrative evaluation and improvement. Research examining the relationship between citizen feedback and public service motivation contributes to understanding how public input may be associated with administrative behavior (Pratama et al., 2025). Investigations of public aspirations and complaints across Indonesian provinces extend the analysis to the relationship between citizen reports and government decision-making (Ibty et al., 2025). Analytical approaches using online citizen complaints to examine environmental management demonstrate the potential informational value of systematically organized reporting data (Jiao et al., 2024). Organizational learning requires more than retaining complaint records because administrative institutions must be able to identify recurring problems and connect them with decisions about procedural or service changes. Such processes also require attention to the completeness and representativeness of reported information, since complaint datasets reflect participation patterns rather than every instance of public dissatisfaction. Table 3 presents an integrated accountability framework distinguishing administrative answerability, responsiveness, substantive correction, and institutional learning.

**Table 3. Proposed Administrative Accountability Framework for Digital Citizen Complaint Management**

| Accountability Dimension | Core Evaluative Question | Proposed Documentary Indicator | Potential Administrative Use |
|---|---|---|---|
| Digital accessibility | Can citizens submit and understand the reporting process? | Public guidance, reporting channels, accessibility provisions | Identify barriers to citizen participation |
| Procedural traceability | Can the administrative progress of a complaint be reconstructed? | Submission, verification, routing, and follow-up records | Identify procedural delays and accountability gaps |
| Administrative answerability | Is the responsible institution identifiable and able to explain its decision? | Assigned authority, official response, decision rationale | Strengthen institutional responsibility |
| Responsiveness | Does the institution provide relevant and procedurally appropriate follow-up? | Response records, documented actions, applicable service procedures | Examine service responsiveness and procedural conformity |
| Substantive resolution | Does the documented outcome address the reported problem? | Remedial action, disposition explanation, closure documentation | Distinguish case processing from corrective action |
| Citizen feedback | Can the complainant respond to the administrative outcome? | Feedback records and applicable review procedures | Examine unresolved concerns and disputed outcomes |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Institutional learning | Are recurring complaints considered in service improvement? | Issue classification, evaluation reports, documented improvement decisions | Inform corrective planning and organizational refor |

Table 3 distinguishes administrative accountability from the narrower technical indicators frequently associated with electronic service delivery. Official reporting materials concerning SP4N-LAPOR! provide a documentary reference for evaluating the relationship between complaint administration and institutional reporting practices (Ministry of Environment, 2026). Research on public information disclosure through the E-GovQual model further demonstrates the relevance of accessible information and service quality to citizen-oriented evaluation (Irianto et al., 2025). Public sentiment analysis concerning SP4N-LAPOR! introduces an additional evidentiary perspective on how reporting services are perceived by citizens (Fadli, 2025). These sources address different dimensions of administrative performance and cannot be treated as interchangeable measurements of substantive complaint resolution. The proposed framework preserves their distinctions by relating institutional records, citizen perceptions, and procedural arrangements to separate accountability questions. This structure provides a basis for future empirical assessment without attributing unverified administrative outcomes to the documentary materials examined.

Automated information processing may strengthen the capacity of public institutions to identify, classify, and organize complaint data, although its contribution to accountability requires further evaluation. Research on artificial intelligence-driven classification of public complaints in Karanganyar provides an example of computational approaches to administrative information management (Al Amin et al., 2025). Investigations combining language modeling and imbalance-sensitive classification in LaporGub illustrate a technical approach to addressing uneven distributions of complaint categories (Zahro et al., 2025). Attention-based classification of citizen requests further demonstrates the application of advanced information processing methods to government–citizen interaction data (Zhang et al., 2025). These approaches may assist complaint categorization or support administrative routing but cannot independently demonstrate that an institution has fulfilled its responsibility to provide an appropriate response. Errors in categorization, inadequate explanations, or unresolved institutional assignments could reduce the value of technically sophisticated processing arrangements. Human administrative oversight and traceable correction procedures remain essential considerations when automated tools are incorporated into complaint management workflows.

Public complaint systems also operate within relationships of administrative authority, institutional trust, and unequal opportunities for citizen participation. Scholarship on grievance redress mechanisms in the global South identifies the political and institutional dimensions of complaint processes as relevant to understanding their operation and consequences (Hossain et al., 2024). Research concerning economic, social, and political determinants of citizen complaints indicates that reporting behavior must be interpreted in relation to the conditions under which individuals engage with public institutions (Sebő & Bel, 2024). Studies of street-level bureaucratic responses to citizen voices provide a complementary perspective on the institutional conditions influencing administrative attention to public concerns (Zhao et al., 2025). These findings suggest that a formally accessible reporting system may still provide an incomplete representation of service problems when participation and institutional attention are unevenly distributed. The absence of complaints cannot independently demonstrate the absence of administrative dissatisfaction, just as high reporting volume cannot independently establish inferior service quality. Accountability evaluation should incorporate both the treatment of received complaints and the limitations of complaint data as representations of citizen experience.

The documentary synthesis positions digital complaint management as a continuous administrative process extending from public accessibility to institutional learning. Studies of digital complaint implementation identify operational and organizational challenges that warrant examination beyond the technical availability of reporting platforms (Indrayani et al., 2025). Research concerning electronic complaint services in Badung Regency provides an additional local perspective on the relationship between electronic government arrangements and complaint administration (Pradnyawati & Widhi Antari, 2024). Stakeholder analysis of digital complaint governance further emphasizes the relevance of institutional relationships when interpreting administrative responsibility (Handrian et al.,

2025). The proposed framework integrates these concerns by distinguishing procedural traceability, institutional answerability, substantive resolution, and corrective learning as connected but analytically separate dimensions. Its contribution remains conceptual and documentary because the investigation did not include protected complaint records, new interviews, direct administrative observation, or independent measurement of national complaint outcomes. Future empirical research could examine the framework through case-level records, documented administrative decisions, and citizen feedback to determine how formal complaint procedures correspond to accountable public service delivery.

## CONCLUSION

The documentary case study identifies digital complaint management as an administrative accountability process extending beyond the reception of citizen reports. Examination of the publicly described SP4N-LAPOR! workflow distinguishes complaint submission, verification, institutional routing, follow-up, communication, and closure as separate points of administrative responsibility. Accessibility and procedural traceability establish conditions for public reporting but do not independently demonstrate substantive resolution. Comparative interpretation of published local studies indicates that participation, responsiveness, procedural compliance, and interagency coordination require distinct forms of evaluation. Differences in institutional settings and research designs prevent these accounts from supporting a uniform assessment of national performance. The analysis further differentiates the visibility of a complaint's status from the adequacy of the decision and corrective action associated with that status. Citizen feedback can inform administrative assessment, although available complaint data are shaped by reporting access and participation patterns. Digital classification tools may assist case organization without replacing the obligation of responsible institutions to explain decisions and address reported problems. Administrative accountability is consequently better assessed through connected evidence of answerability, action, and resolution than through platform availability or case-processing indicators alone.

The study proposes an integrated documentary framework covering digital accessibility, procedural traceability, administrative answerability, responsiveness, substantive resolution, citizen feedback, and institutional learning. This framework clarifies which documentary records would be needed to distinguish formal procedural completion from an adequately justified administrative outcome. For public institutions, its practical implication is to preserve identifiable responsibility, reasoned decisions, coherent status communication, and evidence of corrective follow-up throughout complaint handling. Recurrent complaints should also be considered as possible inputs to service improvement rather than treated only as isolated transactions. The proposed indicators are analytical requirements and have not been validated through direct inspection of individual complaint files. The investigation relied on publicly available institutional descriptions and previously published studies, without interviews, on-site observation, or independent verification of national complaint statistics. Its conclusions therefore concern documented procedures and interpretations of reported local experiences, not measured nationwide compliance or causal effects. Further research could examine anonymized administrative records, disputed closures, and citizen feedback to assess the proposed framework against observable outcomes. Such testing would establish whether stronger procedural traceability is accompanied by meaningful correction and organizational learning in digital public services.

## REFERENCES

Agostino, D., Saliterer, I., & Steccolini, I. (2022). Digitalization, accounting and accountability: A literature review and reflections on future research in public services. *Financial Accountability & Management, 38*(2), 152–176. https://doi.org/10.1111/faam.12301

Al Amin, M. Z., Maulana, F. I., Putra, R. D. S., & Huda, M. N. (2025). From text to action: AI-driven classification of public service complaints in Karanganyar, Indonesia. *Journal of Computing and Smart Ecosystems, 1*(1), 9–25. https://doi.org/10.26714/jcase.v1i1.747

Azzahra, R., Haryono, D., & Zulwisman, Z. (2026). Implementation of SP4N-LAPOR! in the Kampar Regency Government based on Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 5 of 2025. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan, 12*(10.D), 423–434. https://www.jurnal.peneliti.net/index.php/JIWP/article/view/14958

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

Fattah, A. N., Asmansyah, A., Hakim, M. L., & Agung, M. F. M. (2026). Complaint handling performance in the Jogja Smart Service: Responsiveness and SOP compliance. *Pinisi Business Administration Review, 8*(1), 53–66. https://doi.org/10.26858/pbar.v8i1.76402

Handrian, E., Putera, R. E., Asrinaldi, A., & Zetra, A. (2025). Stakeholder dynamics in local digital governance: Evaluating public complaint system in Pekanbaru, Indonesia. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 15*(2). https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v15i2.14280

Hossain, N., Joshi, A., & Pande, S. (2024). The politics of complaint: A review of the literature on grievance redress mechanisms in the global South. *Policy Studies, 45*(2), 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2023.2193387

Ibty, I., Widnyani, I. A. P. S., & Simabura, C. (2025). The decision-making based on public aspirations and complaints through SP4N-Lapor! in three provinces of Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik, 9*(3). https://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/jmpp/article/view/60928

Indrayani, E., Akbar, F., & Diantoro, S. (2025). Overcoming challenges in digital public service delivery: Insights from Lapak Aduan implementation. *TRANSFORMASI: Jurnal Manajemen Pemerintahan, 17*(2), 103–121. https://doi.org/10.33701/jtp.v17i2.3677

Irianto, H., Nurany, F., & Agustina, L. D. (2025). Enhancing public information disclosure through the implementation of SP4N-LAPOR! using the E-GovQual model. *Soshum: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora, 15*(1), 44–52. https://doi.org/10.31940/soshum.v15i1.44-52

Jiao, Y., Li, C., Yao, Z., Weng, C., Lian, A., & Dong, R. (2024). How can online citizen complaints provide solutions to refine environmental management: A spatio-temporal perspective. *Information Processing & Management, 61*(2), 103611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2023.103611

Kirana, A. C., & Humaira, A. (2025). E-government and anti-corruption: Evaluating SP4N-LAPOR! and online complaint systems. *Indonesian Anti Corruption Studies, 2*(1). https://garuda.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/documents/detail/6721600

LAPOR!. (2026). *Layanan Aspirasi dan Pengaduan Online Rakyat: Official portal and reporting workflow*. Government of Indonesia. https://lapor.go.id/

Marrisca, S., & Prastyawan, A. (2024). Analisis pengelolaan layanan pengaduan dalam meningkatkan pelayanan publik (Studi pada SP4N-LAPOR! Kabupaten Gresik). *Jurnal Inovasi Administrasi Negara Terapan, 2*(3). https://doi.org/10.26740/inovant.v2i3.34585

Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs. (2026a). *Frequently asked questions about submitting complaints through SP4N-LAPOR!*. Government of Indonesia. https://kemenkominfo.lapor.go.id/faq

Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs. (2026b). *SP4N-LAPOR! digital public complaint service*. Government of Indonesia. https://djtpd.komdigi.go.id/layanan/sp4n-lapor

Ministry of Environment. (2026). *Laporan tahunan SP4N-LAPOR! tahun 2025*. Government of Indonesia. https://kemenlh.go.id/news/detail/laporan-tahunan-sistem-pengelolaan-pengaduan-pelayanan-publik-nasional-layanan-aspirasi-dan-pengaduan-online-rakyat-sp4n-lapor-tahun-2025

Pradnyawati, N. W. I., & Widhi Antari, N. P. B. (2024). Implementation of public complaint services in Badung Regency based on E-government. *JPAP: Jurnal Penelitian Administrasi Publik, 10*(1), 124–133. https://doi.org/10.30996/jpap.v10i1.10622

Prasasti, I. P. M., Er, M., Sonhaji, A. I., & Nurkasanah, I. (2025). Improving complaint handling service with a qualitative approach: A public sector case. *Journal of Information Technology Teaching Cases, 15*(2), 347–354. https://doi.org/10.1177/20438869231219511

Pratama, A. B., Ahsani, R. D. P., & Wulandari, C. (2025). Does citizen feedback influence public service motivation? Evidence from a survey experiment in the context of urban service provisions. *Public Personnel Management, 54*(1), 3–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/00910260241254669

Pribadi, U., Iqbal, M., Ibrahim, M. A., Juhari, & Ahdarrijal, Y. (2024). Nexus of public organization, transparency, and accountability in Indonesia's digital governance. *Journal of Public Affairs, 24*(3), e2940. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2940

Sabarofek, L. A., Nurmandi, A., & Younus, M. (2024). E-government transformation in improving transparency and accountability of public services in Indonesia. *Varia Justicia, 20*(1), 65–99. https://doi.org/10.31603/z6p57173

Sebő, M., & Bel, G. (2024). E-Government and provision of public services: Economic, social, and political determinants of citizen complaints. *International Public Management Journal, 27*(4), 659–679. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2023.2273343

Suwardi, & Pramono, J. (2025). Service quality of national public service management system in people's online aspiration and complaint services. *KnE Social Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v10i17.19320

Trautendorfer, J., Schmidthuber, L., & Hilgers, D. (2024). Are the answers all out there? Investigating citizen information requests in the haze of bureaucratic responsiveness. *Governance, 37*(3), 845–865. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12805

Umam, A. K., Alzami, F., Sani, R. R., Rohmani, A., Prabowo, D. P., Pergiwati, D., Megantara, R. A., & Iswahyudi, I. (2025). Enhancing entity extraction in E-government complaint data using LDA-assisted NER. *Sinkron: Jurnal dan Penelitian Teknik Informatika, 9*(4), 1878–1888. https://doi.org/10.33395/sinkron.v9i4.15292

Yaniar, S. A., & Fatkhuri, F. (2023). Low citizen e-participation within the Bekasi Nyambung Bae complaint service in Bekasi Regency. *Jurnal Ad'ministrare, 10*(2), 355–366. https://doi.org/10.26858/ja.v10i2.57380

Yunita, N. P., Selina, R. S., & Anggriawan, G. (2024). Portrait of e-government implementation in public complaints services in Indonesia. *The Indonesian Journal of Computer Science, 13*(4), 4398–4410. https://doi.org/10.33022/ijcs.v13i4.4184

Zahro, A. C., Alzami, F., Sani, R. R., Fahmi, A., Megantara, R. A., Naufal, M., Azies, H. A., & Iswahyudi, I. (2025). Fairer public complaint classification on LaporGub: Integrating XLM-RoBERTa with focal loss for imbalance data. *Sinkron: Jurnal dan Penelitian Teknik Informatika, 9*(4), 1850–1862. https://doi.org/10.33395/sinkron.v9i4.15260

Zein, M. H. M., Rifaldi, M. A., & Septiani, S. (2025). Implementasi sistem pengelolaan pengaduan online dalam pelayanan publik: Studi kasus SP4N Lapor. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Humaniora, 4*(2), 268–280. https://doi.org/10.55606/jurrish.v4i2.4823

Zhang, J., Geng, Q., & Jin, J. (2025). EKLI-Attention: An integrated attention mechanism for classifying citizen requests in government–citizen interactions. *Information Processing & Management, 62*(6), 104237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2025.104237

Zhao, X., Li, Y., & Yu, H. (2025). Under what conditions do street-level bureaucrats prioritize citizens' voices? Findings from the 12345 hotline in China. *Policy Studies*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2025.2538852