
ABDIMAS

Jurnal Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15294/abdimas.v30i2.62533> | <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/abdimas/>
© Universitas Negeri Semarang. This is an open-access article under the CC Attribution 4.0 International License.

Strengthening Human Rights Literacy for Campus Workers in the City of Yogyakarta

Cenuk Sayekti^{1*}, Siti Anisah²

¹Postgraduate School, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Sleman, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: sayekti.cenuk@fh.unair.ac.id

Abstract

Campus workers perform academic, administrative, technical, and support functions, yet their access to practical information on human rights at work remains uneven. This community service program aimed to strengthen human rights literacy and safe complaint skills among campus workers in Yogyakarta City. The program was implemented with the Campus Workers Union through four stages: needs assessment, preparation and validation of a practical guide, case-based training, and follow-up assistance. Participants comprised 38 campus workers from five higher education institutions, including lecturers, researchers, administrative staff, librarians, laboratory staff, security and cleaning personnel, information-technology staff, and outsourced workers. Evaluation used a ten-item pre-test and post-test, a simulation rubric, a satisfaction questionnaire, and participants' action plans. The mean knowledge score increased from 5.8 to 8.1, while 80.6% of participants met the minimum simulation standard and 94.4% rated the program useful. The training helped participants connect decent work, equality, academic freedom, freedom of association, documentation, risk assessment, confidentiality, and remedy pathways. The program produced a practical guide and a safe complaint protocol that can be reused by the union. Continued facilitator training, periodic legal updates, and confidential referral networks are recommended to sustain the program.

Keywords: *campus workers, decent work, freedom of association, human rights literacy, safe complaints*

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions do not only function as spaces for education and knowledge production; they are also workplaces. Inside, there are lecturers, researchers, educational staff, librarians, laboratory assistants, information technology administrators, security personnel, cleaning staff, drivers, and outsourced workers. Each group performs different functions, but all retain their dignity and rights as workers. This perspective is crucial because campus issues are often framed solely as internal governance matters, whereas some of these issues also relate to human rights and labor rights. The City of Yogyakarta possesses an educational ecosystem that occupies a prominent position in the city's social and economic life. Official regional development data also positions education as one of the primary social sectors that needs to be read alongside employment and welfare (Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Yogyakarta, 2026). The density of higher education institutions creates numerous forms of employment relationships. In addition to permanent employees, there are contract workers, part-time workers, honorary staff, project-based workers, and workers employed through outsourcing companies. This diversity means that the sources of rights, grievance mechanisms, and workers' bargaining positions are not always identical.

Campus workers' rights have strong constitutional and legal foundations. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees the right to work and to a decent living, fair treatment in employment relations, freedom of association, and freedom of expression. Law Number 39 of 1999

affirms that human rights are inherent in every human being. Law Number 13 of 2003, as amended by Law Number 6 of 2023, regulates equal opportunity and treatment in employment. Meanwhile, Law Number 21 of 2000 protects the freedom of workers to form, join, and operate labor unions. These protections are reinforced by international standards. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights recognizes the right to just and favorable conditions of work. General Comment No. 23 elaborates that this right encompasses fair remuneration, safety, equal opportunity, rest periods, protection from harassment, and access to remedies (Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 2016). ILO Conventions No. 87 and 98 protect freedom of association and collective bargaining. Indonesia has ratified both conventions. Therefore, union membership or activities must not be the basis for detrimental treatment against workers.

For teaching staff and researchers, working conditions are also directly related to academic freedom. Law Number 12 of 2012 recognizes academic freedom, freedom of the academic pulpit, and scientific autonomy. The UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel positions the freedom to teach, conduct research, publish findings, express views regarding the institution, and participate in professional bodies as elements of academic freedom (UNESCO, 1997). This freedom is difficult to exercise when workers face insecure contracts, non-transparent evaluations, excessive dependence on unilateral decisions, or fear of retaliation. The primary issue is not solely the absence of regulations. Legal information is available in numerous documents utilizing technical terms and scattered across various fields. A worker might know that discrimination is prohibited yet be unable to recognize indirect discrimination. Workers may also be aware of grievance channels, but not yet understand the authority of each institution, the evidence that needs to be preserved, the applicable deadlines, or the risks of disclosing sensitive information. The gap between the existence of norms and the ability to utilize them constitutes a human rights literacy problem.

National data from the Campus Workers Union (*Serikat Pekerja Kampus*) indicates that campus workers' welfare issues require attention. The organization's records state that 42.9% of lecturers in a welfare study received wages below IDR 3 million per month, and 58% of educational staff assessed their income as insufficient for living needs (*Serikat Pekerja Kampus*, 2026a). Recent wage statistics also reveal substantial variations by region, type of work, employment status, and institutional characteristics (*Serikat Pekerja Kampus*, 2026b). This national data cannot be immediately assumed to represent the City of Yogyakarta. However, the data highlights the importance of local mapping involving diverse worker categories. Human rights literacy in this program is not understood as the ability to memorize legal articles. Literacy signifies the ability to identify issues, connect them to relevant rights, distinguish facts from allegations, assess risks, systematically retain documents, select grievance channels, and seek advocacy. This approach aligns with community legal education, which prioritizes easily understandable language and the use of knowledge for decision-making. Legal literacy-based community service activities also demonstrate that training is more beneficial when the materials are linked to situations genuinely faced by the participants (Lobubun et al., 2024).

The security aspect is a crucial part of this literacy. Grievances not preceded by a risk assessment can expose identities, escalate conflicts, destroy evidence, or trigger retaliatory actions. Conversely, confidentiality must not be used to force victims into silence. Safe mechanisms need to be built upon consent, access restriction, minimum data collection, option mapping, referral, and monitoring after a report is submitted. This principle aligns with the effectiveness criteria for grievance mechanisms in the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (United Nations, 2011). Based on these problems, this community service activity aims to strengthen the knowledge and skills of campus workers in the City of Yogyakarta in understanding human rights in the workplace. The activity also aims to produce a Practical Human Rights Guide for Campus Workers and a Safe Grievance Protocol that can be reused by the Campus Workers Union. This article elucidates the implementation methods, changes in participants' knowledge and skills, the produced outputs, and the lessons that can be utilized for program replication.

METHOD

The activity employed a participatory, rights-based, and problem-solving-oriented adult education approach. Participants were positioned as rights-holders and sources of experience, rather than passive recipients of information. This method followed human rights training evaluation guidelines, which emphasize needs assessment, measurable learning objectives, participation,

experience-based exercises, multi-layered evaluation, and follow-up (OHCHR & Equitas, 2011).

The program was conducted in the City of Yogyakarta in collaboration with the Campus Workers Union (*Serikat Pekerja Kampus*). The initial target consisted of 40 workers from higher education institutions located within the administrative area of the City of Yogyakarta. Recruitment sought representation from at least five higher education institutions, eight job categories, various employment relationship statuses, and a minimum of 50% female participants. Participants could originate from the groups of lecturers, researchers, educational staff, librarians, laboratory assistants, information technology staff, security personnel, cleaning staff, drivers, and outsourced workers.

The implementation consisted of four stages. The first stage was a needs assessment through a short questionnaire and focus group discussions with prospective participants and union officials. The assessment mapped the most frequently encountered problems, difficult-to-understand legal terms, known grievance channels, documentation barriers, accessibility needs, and fears of retaliation. Individual cases were not collected through open forms. Participants could use anonymous examples or anonymized problem patterns. The second stage involved product development and validation. The team developed a practical guide, a safe grievance protocol, a chronology format, a risk assessment sheet, a document checklist, and a referral map. The materials covered decent work, equality, academic freedom, freedom of expression, freedom of association, violence, documentation, confidentiality, channel selection, and retaliation monitoring. The drafts were evaluated by human rights experts, labor experts, Campus Workers Union representatives, and prospective users from both academic and non-academic groups.

The third stage was a one-day face-to-face training. The training was divided into four blocks: the campus as a workplace; a map of campus workers' rights; documentation and risk assessment; and grievance and advocacy mechanisms. Each brief explanation was followed by classification exercises, group discussions, or simulations. Three fictional scenarios were utilized: assignment reduction following union activities, neutral policies with unequal impacts, and whistleblower identity disclosure without consent. The fourth stage encompassed mentoring and evaluation. Two online clinics were provided to answer questions regarding the use of the guides and instruments. The clinics were not forums for disclosing sensitive cases in front of the group. Participants requiring document reviews or individual legal assistance were directed to referral channels with their consent. Following the clinics, the team revised the products, handed over editable files to the partners, and developed a retraining plan for prospective union facilitators.

Table 1. Program implementation stages

Main activity	Output
Needs and risk assessment	Learning needs map
Development and validation	Test-version guide and protocol
Training and simulation	Knowledge, skills, follow-up plan
Clinic, evaluation, revision	Final product and replication plan

The evaluation utilized four instruments. First, a pre-test and post-test containing ten true-false statements regarding worker status, decent work, discrimination, academic freedom, freedom of association, documentation, confidentiality, and grievances. Second, a simulation rubric assessing six aspects with a score of 0-2: rights identification, separation of facts and allegations, evidence mapping, risk assessment, channel selection, and follow-up plans. Third, a satisfaction questionnaire utilizing a 1-5 scale. Fourth, a follow-up plan recording one action the participant or union unit would take after the activity.

Quantitative data were analyzed descriptively. The analysis encompassed the number of participants completing the activity, the average pre-test and post-test scores, score changes, the percentage of participants achieving the skill standard, and the percentage of participants rating the activity as good or excellent. Open-ended responses were categorized into themes of needs, benefits, obstacles, and improvement suggestions. Because participants were recruited purposively and the activity did not use a control group, the results were not used to make causal claims or generalizations to all campus workers in Yogyakarta.

Program success was determined through several indicators: at least 32 participants completing the training; the average knowledge score increasing by a minimum of 25%; at least 75% of participants achieving a minimum skill score of 9 out of 12; at least 80% of participants rating the materials as useful; and the partner stating their intention to reuse the guide or protocol. All evaluation data were

reported in the aggregate. Attendance lists were separated from evaluation responses, while photo and video documentation utilized separate consent forms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The activity was attended by 28 participants from five higher education institutions in the City of Yogyakarta. A total of 55.3% of the participants were female, and 44.7% were male or identified with other voluntarily listed identities. The participants encompassed eight job categories. The largest group consisted of administrative staff, while the least represented group was information technology staff. This composition successfully met the established diversity targets. The initial assessment indicated three primary needs. First, participants required a simple map connecting human rights, employment, and higher education. Second, participants needed a guide for creating chronologies and managing documents. Third, participants required information regarding grievance options and retaliation risks. Other emergent themes included differences in rights based on employment status, concerns over confidentiality, and the need for collective advocacy. These findings demonstrate that participants did not merely need explanations of the substance of their rights, but also the skills to exercise those rights safely.

Table 2. Participant profile

Indicator	Number	%
Attending participants	38	100
Female participants	21	55.3
Academic workers	17	44.7
Non-academic workers	21	55.3
Contract/outsourced workers	14	36.8
Completed all evaluations	36	94.7

The average pre-test score was 5.8 out of 10, whereas the average post-test score was 8.1. This change of 2.3 points, or 39.7%, met the established improvement target. A total of 33 participants experienced an increase, two participants maintained a constant score, and one participant experienced a decrease. The decrease or constant scores must be interpreted alongside attendance, involvement in the simulation, and potential differences in interpreting the statements within the instrument. The highest improvement was observed in the documentation and confidentiality materials, while the lowest improvement was found in the grievance and anti-retaliation topics. These results indicate that materials closely related to daily experiences are more easily understood when delivered through concrete examples. Conversely, concepts such as indirect discrimination, covert retaliation, and the differing authorities of institutions require repeated exercises. Explanations of norms need to be accompanied by operational questions: what action occurred, who made the decision, who was impacted, what documents are available, and what remedy is required.

A change in knowledge scores does not inherently prove the ability to exercise rights. Human rights training evaluations must assess knowledge, skills, attitudes, and the likelihood of application following the activity (OHCHR & Equitas, 2011). Therefore, the post-test was utilized as one component of the evaluation and was analyzed alongside the simulation rubric and follow-up plans.

Table 3. Changes in participants' knowledge scores

Domain	Pre-test	Post-test
Decent work and equality	61.1%	83.3%
Academic freedom and association	55.6%	80.6%
Documentation and confidentiality	52.8%	83.3%
Grievances and anti-retaliation	63.9%	77.8%
Overall score	58.1%	81.3%

In the simulation, 80.6% of participants achieved a minimum score of 9 out of 12. The highest-scoring aspect was the separation of facts and allegations, whereas the aspects requiring the most reinforcement were pathway mapping and risk assessment. Participants were generally capable of compiling chronologies and identifying supporting documents. However, several groups still conflated allegations with facts and selected grievance channels prior to assessing authority and risks, particularly when a single event possessed more than one resolution pathway.

The chronology exercise assisted participants in separating facts, sources, documents, and conclusions. This separation is vital because records that mix subjective assessments with factual

events complicate the understanding of the case for advocates or authoritative bodies. A robust chronology includes dates, locations or media, involved parties, actions or statements, witnesses, supporting documents, impacts, follow-up actions, and current risks. Original documents are retained without alteration, while working copies are given consistent naming conventions and restricted access. The simulation also demonstrated that selecting a pathway cannot be done simply by choosing the most familiar institution. Participants must assess authority, deadlines, evidence, the reporter's needs, risks, costs, and potential remedies. Internal campus channels, violence prevention and handling task forces, manpower agencies, industrial relations mediators, courts, the National Commission on Human Rights (Komnas HAM), the Ombudsman, labor unions, and legal aid institutions all serve distinct functions. The guide does not prescribe a single universally correct pathway but rather assists participants in asking the right questions before making a selection.

Confidentiality emerged as a topic requiring special emphasis. Case information must not be distributed to messaging groups or social media simply because an advocate believes publication would be helpful. Reporters need to know what information is being recorded, who has access, for what purpose the data is used, and when the data will be deleted. Consent can be revoked. Exceptions can only be made if the law mandates specific actions or if exigent circumstances exist, which must be explained from the outset. This approach is relevant to *Permendikbudristek* Number 55 of 2024, which regulates the prevention and handling of violence in higher education environments. The existence of a specialized mechanism does not negate labor, ethical, criminal, administrative, or human rights pathways. A single event can possess multiple dimensions. Good literacy aids the reporter in understanding their options without promising outcomes and without exposing data more broadly than necessary. Discussions regarding human rights must encompass all campus workers, not solely lecturers. Employment status can indeed determine the type of contract, wages, social security, dispute resolution mechanisms, and responsible parties. However, differences in status do not eliminate basic protections for dignity, equality, safety, freedom of association, and access to remedies. Therefore, the case examples in the training involved both academic and non-academic workers, including outsourced workers who are often situated within longer chains of responsibility.

Equality is also insufficiently understood as merely applying the same rules to everyone. A seemingly neutral policy can have a disproportionate impact on specific groups. Mandatory evening meetings, for instance, can impose an unequal burden on workers with caregiving responsibilities. Inaccessible information systems can deny opportunities to workers with disabilities. Performance evaluations relying heavily on physical attendance without considering reasonable accommodations can result in compounded disadvantages. In the simulation, participants were asked to examine comparators, policy objectives, impacts, differentiating rationales, and potential accommodations. This equality framework is interconnected with violence prevention. *Permendikbudristek* Number 55 of 2024 covers the campus community and regulates mechanisms for violence prevention and handling. Worker literacy needs to clarify that an experience of violence can simultaneously trigger issues of occupational safety, discrimination, ethical violations, criminal acts, or retaliation. Mapping these dimensions is not intended to complicate the process; rather, it helps the reporter understand the purpose of each pathway, the information that needs to be conveyed, and the required support.

For lecturers and researchers, equality in working conditions is directly linked to academic freedom. The freedom to express views regarding the institution becomes fragile if contract continuation, teaching assignments, research access, allowances, or promotions can be altered without transparent justification. UNESCO (1997) asserts that institutional autonomy must not be used as a pretext to limit the rights of higher-education teaching personnel. Consequently, literacy activities position job security, fair evaluation processes, collegial participation, and protection from retaliation as foundational conditions supporting academic freedom. Non-academic workers also hold a vested interest in academic freedom because they maintain the infrastructure that enables teaching, research, and services to occur. However, their protections should not be derived solely from their supportive function to academics. They possess rights as workers in their own standing. Affirming this prevents the program from replicating campus hierarchies that marginalize the experiences of certain workers.

Discussions regarding freedom of association shifted the training's focus from individual issues to collective patterns. Reduced assignments, administrative delays, altered evaluations, promotional barriers, or restricted access might appear as isolated decisions. If such decisions recur after a worker voices a complaint or engages in union activities, the timing and impact patterns must be documented. While such records do not automatically prove retaliation, they assist advocates in examining the correlation between adverse actions and protected activities. Labor unions play a crucial role in

reducing isolation, gathering information, comparing patterns, assisting members, and facilitating dialogue. Law Number 21 of 2000 positions unions as vehicles to fight for, protect, and defend workers' interests and welfare. UNESCO (1997) also recognizes organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel as a force capable of contributing to educational advancement. The involvement of the Campus Workers Union from the needs assessment through to the evaluation made the materials more relatable to workers' experiences and increased the likelihood of product utilization post-program.

Simultaneously, unions must maintain trustworthy grievance governance. The protocol outlines initial intake, consent, urgent needs assessment, preliminary classification, documentation, options and risks, referrals, monitoring, closure, and lessons learned. The protocol also establishes data access restrictions, conflict of interest management, and the use of aggregate data. A uniform structure helps reduce reliance on the individual knowledge of specific advocates. The use of fictional scenarios was a vital element in the activity's design. Participants could test concepts without having to disclose personal cases or name specific institutions. Scenarios also allowed facilitators to halt discussions when participants began making assumptions unsupported by facts. Through this method, the learning space avoided turning into an informal tribunal passing judgment on specific parties.

The participatory method does not imply that facilitators hand over the entire direction of learning to the participants. Facilitators consistently maintained objectives, timekeeping, legal accuracy, safety, and equal speaking opportunities. Participants' experiences were utilized to test whether concepts were applicable, but individual experiences were not automatically assumed to represent all campuses. This principle aligns with human rights education for adults, which integrates experience, reflection, new information, practice, and application planning (OHCHR & Equitas, 2011). Feedback must be directed at the thinking process, not just the final answer. In the simulation, groups that selected different grievance pathways could still achieve high scores if they were able to adequately explain the authority, evidence, benefits, limitations, and risks involved. Conversely, merely identifying the correct institution was deemed insufficient if the group neglected consent or over-disclosed data. Rubrics of this nature help participants understand that safe grievances involve a decision-making process, rather than a rigid, unchanging checklist. Follow-up is necessary because a single training session is insufficient to build advocate capacity. Changes in regulations, campus structures, and referral institution information must be continuously updated. Facilitators also need practice in managing conflicts of interest, requests for case publication, retaliation risks, and the need for psychosocial referrals or legal aid. Therefore, program sustainability is assessed by the reuse of products and the quality of principle application, not just the volume of materials distributed.

The program produced a Practical Human Rights Guide for Campus Workers, a Safe Grievance Protocol, a chronology format, a risk assessment sheet, a document checklist, and a referral map. Based on validator assessments, aspects requiring improvement included simplifying legal jargon, clarifying referral institution authorities, and protecting reporter data. Based on user feedback, primary modifications included adding a grievance pathway flow chart, separating the consent form from the chronology sheet, and refining retaliation risk indicators. The final versions were compiled in both print and digital formats to allow for updates when institutional rules or information change.

A total of 94.4% of participants rated the usefulness of the materials as good or excellent. The highest-rated component was the relevance of the case examples, while the lowest-rated was the duration of the simulation exercises. Participants suggested adding an extra simulation session and a follow-up clinic. Satisfaction data must be interpreted cautiously, as positive ratings do not inevitably equate to behavioral change. More critical sustainability indicators include the integration of instruments into member education, requests for retraining sessions, the quality of referrals, and facilitators' ability to uphold confidentiality principles.

Follow-up actions were designed through prospective facilitator training, periodic legal updates, and the establishment of a verified referral list. The partner expressed a commitment to integrating the guide into member education and appointed two liaisons to manage referrals and material updates. Any reuse must maintain core principles: voluntary participation, fictional scenarios for classrooms, discussion of individual cases in private spaces, minimum data collection, documentation consent, and the prohibition of promising case outcomes.

Table 4. Program indicator achievements

Indicator	Target	Result
Participants completing the activity	>=32	38
Increase in average score	>=25%	39.7%
Passed the skills rubric	>=75%	80.6%
Rated good/excellent	>=80%	94.4%
Product adoption by partner	Yes	Yes

The program encountered several limitations. First, participants were recruited purposively, meaning the results do not represent all campus workers in the City of Yogyakarta. Second, the pre-test and post-test design without a control group only illustrates changes before and after the activity, not definitive proof that the training was the sole cause of the change. Third, short-term evaluations cannot yet confirm that participants truly utilize the knowledge when confronting actual problems. Fourth, workers' needs are heavily influenced by employment status and institutional rules, meaning a single guide cannot replace individual case reviews. These limitations must be addressed through follow-up evaluations three to six months post-program, segregating analysis by job category, adding dedicated sessions for outsourced workers, and assessing the quality of protocol implementation by facilitators. Replications must also adapt the institutional map, internal policies, and accessibility needs to each specific location.

CONCLUSION

Strengthening human rights literacy for campus workers requires connecting norms with practical action. It is insufficient for workers to merely know the names of rights or regulation numbers. They must be capable of identifying problems, compiling chronologies, safeguarding documents, assessing risks, selecting pathways, requesting consent, protecting confidentiality, and monitoring retaliation. Participatory and case-based approaches help bring these concepts closer to the participants' actual work experiences. The implementation in the City of Yogyakarta demonstrated an increase in the average score from 5.8 to 8.1. A total of 80.6% of participants achieved the skill standard, and 94.4% found the materials useful. These data points successfully met the program indicators. The primary qualitative findings emphasized the need to connect norms with practical decision-making, the importance of chronologies and evidence management, and the necessity for safe grievance mechanisms and collective support. The final results should be interpreted within the boundaries of the descriptive design and purposive recruitment. The sustainability of the program relies heavily on the Campus Workers Union's ability to utilize and update the products. Therefore, the program must be followed by facilitator training, legal foundation updates, evaluations after three to six months, and the strengthening of referral networks. Any program replication must uphold consent, minimum data, confidentiality, accessibility, and the prohibition of retaliation as its foundational principles.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI

The authors declare that no generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used in the writing process of this manuscript.

CONFLICTING INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors states that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

FUNDING INFORMATION STATEMENT

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Yogyakarta. (2026). *Kota Yogyakarta dalam Angka 2026*. BPS Kota Yogyakarta.
- Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2016). *General Comment No. 23 (2016) on the Right to Just and Favourable Conditions of Work* (E/C.12/GC/23). Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- International Labour Organization. (1948). *Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87)*. International Labour Organization.

- International Labour Organization. (1949). *Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949 (No. 98)*. International Labour Organization.
- International Labour Organization. (1958). *Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)*. International Labour Organization.
- Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia. (2020). *Standar Norma dan Pengaturan Nomor 3 tentang Hak atas Kebebasan Berkumpul dan Berorganisasi*. Komnas HAM.
- Lobubun, M., Sari, R. I. R., & Rifaldi, A. (2024). Mencerdaskan Kehidupan Masyarakat Pesisir: Pendampingan Literasi Digital Berbasis Hukum sebagai Implementasi Pasal 31 UUD 1945 di Biak Timur. *Legal Empowerment: Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum*, 2(2), 76–86.
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, & Equitas. (2011). *Evaluating Human Rights Training Activities: A Handbook for Human Rights Educators*. United Nations.
- Republik Indonesia. (1999). *Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1999 Nomor 165.
- Republik Indonesia. (2000). *Undang-Undang Nomor 21 Tahun 2000 tentang Serikat Pekerja/Serikat Buruh*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2000 Nomor 131.
- Republik Indonesia. (2003). *Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 tentang Ketenagakerjaan*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2003 Nomor 39.
- Republik Indonesia. (2005a). *Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2005 tentang Pengesahan International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor 118.
- Republik Indonesia. (2005b). *Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2005 tentang Pengesahan International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor 119.
- Republik Indonesia. (2005c). *Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor 157.
- Republik Indonesia. (2012). *Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2012 Nomor 158.
- Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Nomor 55 Tahun 2024 tentang Pencegahan dan Penanganan Kekerasan di Lingkungan Perguruan Tinggi*. Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2024 Nomor 525.
- Serikat Pekerja Kampus. (2026a). *Sejarah Serikat Pekerja Kampus*. Serikat Pekerja Kampus.
- Serikat Pekerja Kampus. (2026b). *Statistik Upah Pekerja Kampus*. Serikat Pekerja Kampus.
- UNESCO. (1997). *Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- United Nations. (2011). *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework*. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.