

# BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)

**Arif Budiman**

Judicial Commission, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: [arifbudiman@komisiyudisial.go.id](mailto:arifbudiman@komisiyudisial.go.id)

Received : 20 November 2025

Published : 24 January 2026

Revised : 01 December 2025

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.54443/morfaiv6i2.5047>

Accepted : 30 December 2025

Publish Link : <https://radjapublika.com/index.php/MORFAI/article/view/5047>**Abstract**

The role of external oversight institutions in maintaining the integrity of the judicial system is becoming increasingly important in contemporary governance. However, there is often a significant gap between institutional mandates and public perceptions, resulting in diminished public trust in judicial institutions. This study proposes a conceptual model of *Corporate Social Responsibility* (CSR) adapted from the private sector for application to the context of state institutions, using the Indonesian Judicial Commission as a comprehensive case study. Using a qualitative exploratory approach, the study analyzes the Commission's constitutional mandate in depth, combined with a review of contemporary CSR frameworks to assess its applicability to public oversight functions. The findings suggest that the adaptive application of CSR principles—such as operational transparency, authentic public participation, and sustainable community empowerment—can significantly enhance institutional legitimacy and the effectiveness of external oversight. This study introduces a CSR model tailored to the context of state institutions, comprising three key interrelated dimensions: legal education and civic awareness, public advocacy and institutional socialization, and community empowerment through participatory governance. The study suggests that CSR is not simply a tool to enhance corporate image, but a vital and strategic instrument for strengthening public trust and accountability in the modern judicial governance system.

**Keywords:** *Accountability; Corporate Social Responsibility; External Oversight; Judicial Commission; State Institutions; Institutional Legitimacy; Public Governance*

**INTRODUCTION****Background and Context of the Research**

The legitimacy of judicial institutions in a democratic society fundamentally depends on public trust and confidence in their independence, integrity, and ethical conduct [1]. In the Indonesian context, the judicial system faces a dual challenge: on the one hand, there are high public expectations regarding the quality of judicial decisions and the protection of access to justice; on the other hand, there are doubts about the consistency of ethical enforcement and the accountability of judges [2]. External oversight mechanisms designed to safeguard judicial integrity often operate with limited public engagement, resulting in a perception gap between institutional mandates and actual social impact on society. The Indonesian Judicial Commission ( *Judicial Commission* ), established through the 1945 Constitution as a result of constitutional amendments and further formalized by Law Number 18 of 2011, perfectly exemplifies this complex paradox [3]. Despite its crucial role in overseeing the conduct, dignity, and integrity of judges, public awareness and appreciation of its performance remains marginal. Public awareness surveys indicate that the majority of Indonesians have limited knowledge of the Judicial Commission's functions and roles, even among legal professionals [4].

**Evolution of the CSR Concept from the Private Sector to the Public Sector**

Publish by Radja Publik



OPEN ACCESS

# **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

The concept of *Corporate Social Responsibility* (CSR), traditionally rooted in corporate governance and business ethics, has evolved dramatically in the last two decades [5]. Contemporary CSR discourse increasingly transcends the narrow focus on maximizing corporate profits and shifts to a broader concept of the responsibility of organizations—including public institutions and state institutions—to create value beyond their primary functions by addressing more complex social needs and expectations [6]. This expansion reflects a fundamental shift in the paradigm of institutional accountability: from mere technical or legal compliance to meaningful engagement with stakeholders and the creation of measurable social value. In the Indonesian context, Law No. 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies has made CSR a legal obligation for companies, not just a voluntary practice [7]. This evolution opens up opportunities for the adaptation of CSR principles to state institutions.

## **Research Problem Exploration**

The gap between institutional oversight and effective public engagement represents both a challenge and an opportunity for contemporary judicial governance. Integrating CSR principles into the operational and strategic frameworks of judicial oversight bodies—such as the Judicial Commission—offers a promising path to bridging this gap and substantially strengthening institutional legitimacy. The current scholarly literature on the adaptation of CSR to the public sector, particularly in the context of judicial oversight bodies in developing democracies, remains very limited and requires in-depth exploration [8]. While numerous studies have examined CSR in state-owned enterprises and regulatory bodies, few have detailed the specific challenges and opportunities facing judicial oversight bodies in the context of developing countries like Indonesia. This gap in the academic literature represents both a significant research opportunity and a pressing practical need.

## **Research Objectives and Contributions**

The primary objective of this research is to develop and validate a conceptual model of CSR specifically designed for state oversight institutions, using the Judicial Commission as a detailed and context-rich case study. It also aims to provide implementable recommendations to improve the effectiveness and legitimacy of judicial oversight institutions in Indonesia and similar regional contexts. Secondary objectives include: (1) comprehensively analyzing the constitutional and legal foundations of the Judicial Commission's mandate; (2) identifying and evaluating applicable CSR principles from existing private and public sector frameworks; (3) proposing CSR implementation mechanisms tailored to Indonesia's specific institutional context; (4) suggesting measurable indicators of CSR effectiveness in enhancing institutional legitimacy and public engagement; and (5) conducting a comparative analysis with CSR practices in international judicial oversight bodies.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Institutional Legitimacy Theory**

Institutional legitimacy is a fundamental concept in understanding how organizations maintain public trust and a social license to operate [9]. Suchman (1995) defines legitimacy as the general perception or assumption that an entity's actions are appropriate, proper, or appropriate within a society's system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions [10]. In the context of judicial institutions, legitimacy depends not only on the technical effectiveness of oversight, but also on public perceptions of the institution's fairness, transparency, and commitment to the public interest. Legitimacy theory identifies three main strategies for maintaining and strengthening legitimacy: adaptive strategies (adjusting behavior to environmental expectations), representative strategies (representing values supported by society), and decorative strategies (using symbols and rituals) [11]. For oversight institutions such as the Judicial Commission, a combination of these three strategies—with an emphasis on adaptive and representative strategies—can strengthen institutional legitimacy in a sustainable manner.

### **Stakeholder Engagement**

The stakeholder engagement model underscores the importance of ongoing and authentic dialogue between organizations and the various groups that have an interest in the organization [12]. Freeman et al. (2010) argue that genuine stakeholder engagement not only increases legitimacy, but also results in better decisions and policies that are more responsive to societal needs [13]. In the context of the Judicial Commission, key stakeholders include judges, court personnel, legal professionals, legal academics, civil society organizations, human rights organizations, and the general public. Meaningful engagement with these groups can yield valuable insights into actual oversight needs and opportunities to improve institutional effectiveness.

# BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)

Arif Budiman

---

## Public Value Creation

The concept of public value creation, as developed by Moore (2013), extends the logic of value creation beyond profit-maximization in the context of public organizations [14]. In this model, state institutions are obliged to create value beyond technical compliance with their formal mandate by making real contributions to public welfare and democratic development. In the context of the Judicial Commission, public value creation may include: (1) contributing to public legal literacy through educational programs; (2) strengthening public trust in the judicial system through increased transparency and accountability; (3) developing norms of judicial ethics that are widely understood and supported by the public; and (4) promoting a culture of accountability and integrity within judicial institutions.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODS

### 3.1 Research Design

This research adopts a qualitative exploratory methodology, combining comprehensive desktop research, normative legal analysis, and a critical review of institutional documentation. This approach integrates phenomenological and ethnomet hodological elements to gain a deeper understanding of the formal institutional structure, organizational culture, and social perceptions surrounding the role and function of the Judicial Commission. The choice of qualitative methodology was based on several strategic considerations. First, this research seeks to understand the complex context and institutional contingencies that cannot be fully captured through quantitative approaches. Second, the exploratory nature of this research necessitates methodological flexibility to identify relevant principles and innovative implementation mechanisms. Third, the focus on conceptual adaptation requires a deep understanding of how CSR ideas can be translated and adapted in different institutional contexts.

### 3.2 Research Design Components

The research design consists of four integrated components:

#### Component One: Comprehensive Literature Review

The literature review examined existing CSR theories, frameworks, and case studies from the private and public sectors, prioritizing recent publications (2019–2025) to ensure contemporary relevance. The sources analyzed included peer-reviewed academic journals, reports from international organizations, and documentation of CSR practices in various countries. The review specifically sought CSR principles that have potential transferability to public institutional contexts.

#### Component Two: Institutional Analysis

This component comprehensively reviews the constitutional basis, legal mandate, operational structure, and current practices of the Judicial Commission as stipulated by the 1945 Constitution (especially Articles 24B-24D) and Law Number 18 of 2011. This analysis also includes a critical examination of institutional performance reports, internal policies, existing public communication initiatives, and patterns of engagement with external stakeholders.

#### Component Three: International Comparative Analysis

This component identifies applicable CSR principles and relevant adaptation mechanisms for public oversight bodies through a detailed examination of case studies of international judicial oversight bodies, including the Australian Magistrates Court, the New Zealand Judicial Conduct Commissioner, the French Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature, and similar bodies in countries with comparable judicial systems.

#### Fourth Component: Synthesis and Model Development

The final component synthesizes the findings from the previous three components to develop a CSR model tailored to the specific context of the Judicial Commission, accompanied by practical and measurable implementation recommendations.

### 3.3 Data Sources and Data Collection

The main research materials include:

# BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)

Arif Budiman

1. Indonesian constitutional texts and judicial legislation governing the Judicial Commission, including the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 18 of 2011, and derivative regulations;
2. The Judicial Commission's official publication and annual report (2019-2025) documenting institutional activities, performance statistics, and public engagement initiatives;
3. Academic journals and conference proceedings on CSR, judicial governance, institutional accountability, and public transparency;
4. Comparative case studies and reports from international judicial oversight institutions;
5. Publications from international organizations such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), OECD, and Transparency International on best practices in justice governance.

The research prioritizes primary legal sources, recent academic publications from peer-reviewed journals (75% of total sources), institutional reports (15%), and grey literature (10%) to ensure contemporary relevance while maintaining access to established and proven theoretical frameworks.

## 3.4 Thematic Analysis Framework

The analysis used inductive and deductive thematic coding to identify:

1. **Institutional mandate** : The formal functions of the Judicial Commission as constitutionally established and their potential social impact;
2. **Applicable CSR dimensions** : Contemporary CSR principles that have relevance and implementation potential in the context of public oversight;
3. **Implementation mechanisms** : Concrete ways in which CSR can be integrated into institutional operations;
4. **Stakeholder expectations** : Perceptions and needs of internal and external stakeholders regarding the supervisory function;
5. **Barriers and supporting factors** : Structural, financial and political challenges in CSR adoption, and opportunities to overcome these barriers;
6. **International comparative practice** : Learning from the experiences of similar institutions in other countries.

The theoretical framework of the analysis draws on three main complementary theories:

- Institutional legitimacy theory (Suchman, 1995) to understand the mechanisms of building public trust;
- Stakeholder engagement model (Freeman et al., 2010) to analyze the importance of meaningful dialogue with stakeholders;
- The public value creation literature (Moore, 2013) to understand how state institutions can contribute beyond technical compliance.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Constitutional Mandate and Challenges to the Legitimacy of the Judicial Commission

#### 4.1.1 Constitutional Foundation and Authority

The Judicial Commission holds significant constitutional responsibility to safeguard the honor, dignity, and ethical conduct of judges as mandated by Articles 24B-24D of the 1945 Constitution. Specifically, the Commission is given four main functions: first, nominating prospective judges in consultation with the Supreme Court and other stakeholders; second, supervising and investigating complaints regarding the behavior and ethical violations of judges; third, imposing disciplinary sanctions when misconduct is proven; and fourth, providing recommendations to strengthen the integrity, independence, and professionalism of the judicial institution [15]. This mandate positions the Judicial Commission as the primary external oversight mechanism for the Indonesian justice system, with strategic authority and responsibility to maintain public confidence in the judiciary and promote the rule of law at the national level. This distinguishes the Commission from other oversight institutions because of its specific focus on the ethics and personal conduct of judges rather than on the procedural or substantive aspects of judicial decisions.

#### 4.1.2 The Mandate-Perception Gap: The Actual Legitimacy Challenge

# **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

---

Despite having a strong formal mandate, an examination of the Commission's publications, institutional performance reports, and public awareness surveys reveals a significant gap between the maximum potential of the constitutional mandate and the actual social impact of the Commission's operations[16].

## **Communication Isolation and Limited Transparency**

The first finding indicates that the Judicial Commission's formal functions largely operate within closed institutional channels and have limited public accessibility. Public communication regarding investigative results, disciplinary decisions, and recommendation processes remains minimal. The Commission's institutional website, while providing basic information on organizational structure, grievance procedures, and profiles of institutional leaders, does not substantially document or communicate investigative results, patterns of ethical misconduct, institutional performance metrics, or the impact of disciplinary decisions on the integrity of the justice system. This lack of transparency creates a serious perception gap: while the Commission consistently carries out critical and complex oversight functions, its institutional impact on public understanding of judicial ethics and judicial accountability remains largely invisible and unacknowledged by the majority of the public [17].

## **Limited Public Awareness**

Public awareness surveys indicate that the majority of Indonesian citizens—even among legal professionals and academics—remain unfamiliar with the role, function, structure, and achievements of the Judicial Commission [18]. Qualitative research indicates that when asked about the Judicial Commission, many respondents expressed superficial knowledge or confused it with the Constitutional Court or other judicial institutions. This limited awareness directly limits the Commission's ability to contribute to the legitimacy of the broader judicial system and public trust in efforts to uphold judicial integrity.

## **Limited Stakeholder Engagement**

Although the Commission has a formal mechanism for receiving and processing public complaints, external stakeholder engagement in institutional decision-making, priority-setting, and impact evaluation processes remains limited. Dialogue with civil society organizations, legal professional associations, and communities affected by judicial misconduct is less systematic and sustained.

## **4.2 CSR Principles in the Context of Public Oversight: An In-Depth Analysis**

### **4.2.1 Operational Transparency and Accountability**

#### **Definition and Significance**

Transparency and accountability are two interrelated but distinct concepts in institutional CSR practices. Transparency refers to the openness and visibility of institutional operations, decision-making processes, and achieved results. Accountability, on the other hand, refers to the responsibility of an institution to explain its decisions, accept criticism and suggestions, and be willing to face consequences if it does not meet promised standards [19]. In the contemporary CSR framework, transparency and accountability are not merely abstract aspirations but concrete mechanisms through which organizations build trust with stakeholders and demonstrate their commitment to good governance [20]. For public oversight institutions such as the Judicial Commission, transparency and accountability have a dual significance: first, as a way to demonstrate that the institution itself adheres to the same standards of integrity that it is mandated to maintain; second, as a mechanism to enable external scrutiny and feedback that can drive continuous improvement in institutional performance.

#### **Practical Implementation Mechanisms**

Implementation of transparency and accountability within the Judicial Commission could include: (1) publication of annual performance reports detailing the number of complaints received, the types of ethical violations investigated, patterns of violations identified, disciplinary decisions imposed, and the estimated impact of these decisions on the integrity of the justice system; (2) development of an interactive dashboard or digital platform that allows the public to access detailed information on the status of their complaints, the timeline of the investigation process, and the results achieved; (3) publication of summaries of significant or precedent-setting investigative cases (while maintaining the confidentiality of personal information as required by law); (4) conducting periodic independent audits of the Commission's processes to evaluate their effectiveness, consistency, and alignment with international

## **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

---

standards; and (5) publication of analytical studies on trends in judicial ethics, contributing factors to violations, and recommendations for prevention.

### **4.2.2 Authentic Stakeholder Engagement and Dialogue**

#### **In-depth Understanding of External Stakeholders**

In the context of the Judicial Commission, significant external stakeholders include: (1) judges and judicial personnel who are the subject of oversight; (2) legal professional associations such as the Indonesian Judges Association and the Bar Association; (3) civil society organizations that focus on access to justice, human rights protection, and public transparency; (4) victim protection organizations and groups affected by judicial misconduct; (5) mass media and independent research institutions; (6) legal academics and legal education institutions; and (7) the general public as potential users of the justice system. Each of these stakeholder groups has different perspectives, concerns, and interests regarding the Judicial Commission's functions. Deeply understanding these differences and allowing for diverse voices in institutional processes is key to creating authentic and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

#### **Structured and Sustainable Engagement Mechanisms**

Effective implementation of stakeholder engagement could include: (1) the establishment of regular consultative forums with legal professional associations and key civil society organizations to discuss institutional priorities, operational challenges, and opportunities for improvement; (2) the holding of regular public forums or townhall meetings in various regions to hear directly from the community concerns regarding judicial ethics issues; (3) the development of formal mechanisms to process, analyze, and respond to stakeholder feedback, accompanied by transparency regarding the actions taken as a result; (4) the establishment of advisory panels or committees consisting of representatives from various stakeholder groups to provide strategic input on institutional policy development; and (5) the creation of a feedback loop system that allows stakeholders to see how their suggestions have been considered and integrated into institutional decisions.

### **4.2.3 Social Value Creation Beyond Pure Regulatory Functions**

#### **The Concept and Implications of Social Value Creation**

In the context of institutional CSR, social value creation goes beyond mere compliance with the institution's formal mandate. It requires institutions to proactively identify ways in which they can contribute to broader social goals and the overall public welfare [21]. For the Judicial Commission, this dimension includes recognizing that the oversight function can be combined with educational initiatives, awareness-building, and contributions to public discourse on judicial ethics and justice system reform. The creation of social value not only enhances institutional legitimacy but also strengthens the effectiveness of core functions by building stronger public understanding and support for judicial ethical standards and the importance of judicial accountability.

#### **Concrete Initiatives for Social Value Creation**

Implementation of social value creation could include: (1) development of a judicial ethics education curriculum that can be integrated into university legal education programs, including real-life case studies from the Commission's experience (while maintaining the necessary confidentiality); (2) holding regular training programs and workshops for legal professionals, young judges, and law students on ethical standards and accountability mechanisms; (3) publishing easily understandable guidelines and reference materials for the general public on their rights to report judicial ethics violations and the processes to be followed; (4) collaboration with media organizations to develop public awareness campaigns on the importance of judicial integrity and the Commission's role in safeguarding it; and (5) contributing to academic and policy discourse on judicial system reform and accountability enhancement efforts through research publications, participation in academic conferences, and collaboration with research institutions.

### **4.2.4 Public Participation and Co-Production in Supervision**

#### **The Logic and Benefits of Co-Production The**

co-production approach to oversight recognizes that the creation of effective and legitimate oversight mechanisms requires the active participation of the public being served [22]. In the context of the Judicial Commission, the public is not only a passive beneficiary of oversight efforts, but also has valuable knowledge, perspectives, and interests to be integrated into oversight processes.

# **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

Public participation in co-production can yield several significant benefits: (1) more complete and representative information on judicial ethics issues because it includes perspectives from diverse groups in society; (2) oversight mechanisms that are more responsive to the community's true needs and concerns; (3) increased legitimacy of oversight because the community feels it has a voice in the processes that affect it; and (4) strengthened oversight capacities through the mobilization of community resources and knowledge.

## **Practical Mechanisms for Public Participation and Co-Production**

Implementation could include: (1) the establishment of citizen oversight panels composed of representatives of the general community who are trained to understand judicial ethics standards and can provide informed perspectives on judicial conduct and institutional decisions; (2) the development of partnerships with legal aid organizations, community legal clinics, and advocacy organizations to facilitate the reporting of complaints from groups less able to access formal mechanisms; (3) the holding of regular community forums in various regions to hear about the public's firsthand experiences of interacting with the justice system and to identify potential patterns of ethical problems; (4) the development of a user-friendly online reporting system that allows the public to easily report any judicial ethics violations they witness or experience; and (5) the creation of a feedback loop mechanism that allows reporting members of the public to receive updates on the status of their reports and the results of investigations (within permissible limits of confidentiality).

## **4.2.5 Building Long-Term Trust and Legitimacy**

### **Dynamics of Institutional Trust Building**

Public trust in judicial oversight institutions is built through a combination of three interrelated elements: first, demonstrative effectiveness in carrying out oversight functions (evidence that the institution actually catches and addresses ethical violations); second, consistency of ethical behavior of the institution itself, including fair and transparent treatment of all stakeholders; and third, responsiveness to public concerns and feedback, accompanied by concrete actions to address identified problems [23]. Trust-building is a long-term process that requires ongoing and consistent commitment from institutional leadership, as well as internalization of trust-building values into the organizational culture.

### **Long-Term Strategy for Trust-Building**

Implementation could include: (1) the development of an explicit and binding institutional code of ethics for all Commission personnel, with mechanisms to enforce the code and demonstrate that the institution holds itself to the same standards as those mandated for judges; (2) the implementation of ongoing training programs for Commission personnel on the importance of institutional integrity, public responsiveness, and effective communication; (3) the creation of an external accountability mechanism through regular independent audits of the Commission's operations, accompanied by public publication of the audit findings; (4) the development of a proactive and responsive communications strategy that goes beyond formal press releases to engage in a two-way dialogue with the public; and (5) the creation of a grievance resolution mechanism regarding the Commission's own operations, with a clear non-retaliation policy for complainants.

## **4.3 A Three-Dimensional CSR Model Adapted for the Judicial Commission**

### **4.3.1 First Dimension: Legal Education and Civil Awareness**

#### **Conceptual Foundation and Strategic Objectives**

The first dimension of the proposed CSR model focuses on the development and implementation of systematic educational initiatives designed to increase public understanding of judicial ethics, the standards of conduct expected of judges, the role of the Judicial Commission in safeguarding judicial integrity, and the broader justice system [24]. The strategic objective of this dimension is to create a stronger foundation of public knowledge that can support oversight efforts and raise collective awareness of the importance of judicial integrity to democracy. Legal education for the general public is an area that has traditionally received little attention in the Indonesian justice system, even though legal literacy is an essential prerequisite for meaningful access to justice and informed public participation in legal processes.

#### **Specific Operational Components**

of First Dimension Implementation may include:

# BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)

Arif Budiman

1. **Educational Programs in Schools and Communities** : Development of judicial ethics curriculum materials that can be integrated into legal education programs in universities, high schools, and community education courses. These materials could include real-life case studies (while maintaining necessary confidentiality), discussions of ethical standards, and explanations of accountability mechanisms.
2. **Digital Learning Platform** : Develop a website, mobile app, or e-learning platform that provides easy and affordable access to educational materials on judicial ethics, the functions of the Judicial Commission, how to report ethical violations, and stories about how oversight efforts have strengthened the integrity of the judicial system. This platform can be complemented by educational videos, infographics, interactive quizzes, and discussion forums.
3. **Community Seminars and Workshops** : Regular educational events in various locations (urban and rural) bringing together Commission staff, judges, legal academics, and representatives of civil society organizations to discuss judicial ethics issues relevant to local communities. These events can be tailored to the local context and the specific needs of different communities.
4. **Partnerships with Educational Institutions** : Developing strategic partnerships with university law faculties to integrate CSR and institutional accountability modules into the curricula of law programs, as well as to manage internship programs at the Commission that provide students with opportunities to learn about oversight operations firsthand.
5. **Reference Resources and Toolkits** : Publication of comprehensive guides, fact sheets, and toolkits that are easy for the general public to understand regarding their rights in accessing the justice system, procedures for reporting judicial ethics violations, what to expect in the investigation process, and the potential outcomes of their reports.

## 4.3.2 Second Dimension: Public Advocacy and Institutional Socialization

### Conceptual Foundation and Strategic Objectives

The second dimension focuses on developing a systematic and sustainable public communication strategy aimed at increasing institutional visibility, explaining the benefits of oversight efforts, building public understanding of the importance of judicial integrity for democracy, and strengthening the Commission's position as an institution committed to building public trust [25]. Public advocacy in this context does not mean propaganda or manipulation of public opinion, but authentic and transparent communication about what the institution does, why it matters, and the results it has achieved. Effective public advocacy requires a careful balance of different communication channels, message types, and engagement strategies to reach diverse audiences in ways that resonate with their values and concerns.

### Specific Operational Components

of Second Dimension Implementation may include:

1. **Annual Social Accountability Reports** : Publishing comprehensive annual reports that go beyond the traditional performance report format by using compelling narratives, data visualizations, and concrete examples to explain: the impacts of oversight efforts on the integrity of the justice system, identified patterns of ethical misconduct and lessons learned from those patterns, challenges facing the institution, and strategies to address those challenges. These reports should be published in a format that is easily accessible and understandable to the general public, not just legal professionals.
2. **Public Briefings and Press Releases** : Holding regular press conferences and public briefings on significant or precedent-setting investigative cases (within permissible limits of confidentiality), important investigative results, and institutional recommendations regarding the enhancement of judicial integrity.
3. **Media Engagement and Communication Strategy** : Developing strong relationships with the mass media, both traditional and social media, by: providing access to information and experts, developing press kits and backgrounders that enable journalists to report accurately on judicial ethics issues, and proactively identifying opportunities for story placement that can increase public awareness of the Commission's functions.
4. **Thematic Advocacy Campaigns** : Development of focused advocacy campaigns that use a variety of media (video, posters, social media, radio spots) to communicate key messages regarding: the importance of judicial integrity and ethics for democracy and the rule of law; how the public can report judicial ethics violations; and how oversight efforts have resulted in concrete improvements in judicial behavior or institutional policy changes.

# BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)

Arif Budiman

5. **Social Media Presence and Online Engagement** : Developing an active and responsive social media strategy that utilizes platforms like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter/X, and TikTok to reach diverse audiences with content tailored to the characteristics and preferences of each platform. This content can include educational content, behind-the-scenes glimpses of institutional operations, statistical infographics, Q&A sessions with Commission staff, and sharing stories of the impact of oversight efforts.
6. **Collaboration with Influencers and Opinion Leaders** : Collaborate with public figures, academic influencers, and opinion leaders who have high credibility and a large audience to spread messages about the importance of judicial integrity and the functions of the Judicial Commission.
- 7.

## 4.3.3 Third Dimension: Community Empowerment and Participatory Governance

### Conceptual Foundation and Strategic Objectives

The third dimension emphasizes the importance of creating mechanisms through which communities and civil society can participate actively, meaningfully, and sustainably in institutional oversight and governance processes [26]. The strategic objective of this dimension is to transform communities from being mere passive beneficiaries of oversight efforts into active co-producers who have a role in shaping institutional direction and ensuring that institutional operations are responsive to the real needs of the community. Community empowerment in this context is based on the premise that oversight efforts will be more effective and sustainable when supported by strong community capacities and engagement, and that communities have the right to have a voice in the institutions that affect their access to justice.

### Specific Operational Components

of Third Dimension Implementation may include:

1. **Formal Consultation Mechanisms** : Establishment of regular (e.g., quarterly or semi-annual) consultative forums with civil society organizations, legal professional associations, victim protection organizations, and community representatives to discuss institutional priorities, operational challenges, and opportunities for improvement. These forums may take the form of roundtable discussions, focus group discussions, or public hearings, depending on the specific context and objectives.
2. **Community-Based Monitoring Initiatives** : Develop programs that train and empower ordinary citizens (recruited from diverse backgrounds and demographics) to serve as institutional monitors who can observe Commission operations, attend public hearings, and provide feedback on institutional performance and responsiveness. These community monitors can be provided with training on judicial ethics standards, oversight mechanisms, and how to provide constructive, evidence-based feedback.
3. **Feedback Mechanisms and Responsiveness** : Develop a formal system to receive, analyze, prioritize, and respond to feedback from communities and civil society organizations. This system should include: channels for feedback (email, online form, hotline, face-to-face meetings); clear and promised response times; and transparency regarding actions taken as a result of the feedback received. When feedback cannot be acted upon for legitimate reasons (such as legal restrictions or confidentiality), institutions should explain those reasons clearly and constructively.
4. **Capacity Building Programs** : Conducting training and capacity-building programs for civil society organizations and community representatives to increase their understanding of: the judicial system and judicial ethical standards, how to identify and report ethical violations, ways to participate effectively in institutional consultation processes, and strategies for advocacy on judicial ethics issues at the community level.
5. **Partnerships with Civil Society Organizations** : Developing strategic partnerships with legal aid organizations, community legal clinics, human rights organizations, and other advocacy organizations to expand the reach of the Commission's reporting mechanisms, raise public awareness of the Commission's functions, and facilitate participation by groups less able to access formal mechanisms. These partnerships may include: joint training programs, co-hosting of public forums, reciprocal referrals, and collaborative research or advocacy initiatives.
6. **Online Participatory Platforms** : Development of digital platforms that enable the community to: report judicial ethics violations in a user-friendly manner, provide feedback on the Commission's operations, access information on the status of their reports, and participate in online discussions on judicial ethics issues. These

# BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)

Arif Budiman

platforms should be designed with the diverse levels of digital literacy in mind and provide non-digital alternatives for access and participation.

## 5. INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON: CSR PRACTICES IN JUDICIAL SUPERVISORY INSTITUTIONS

### 5.1 Comparative Analysis with International Practices

#### 5.1.1 Magistrates Court Australia: Public Education and Engagement as Top Priorities

##### The

Magistrates Court's public engagement strategies can provide valuable lessons for the Judicial Commission.

##### Key CSR Initiatives

1. **School Education Programs** : The Magistrates Court has developed comprehensive educational programs for high school students aimed at improving their understanding of the justice system, legal rights, and access to justice. These programs include: court visits guided by a judge or court staff, curriculum materials that can be integrated into civics or law classes, and educational videos that explain court processes in ways that are easy for teenagers to understand.
2. **Community Engagement Initiatives** : The court regularly holds public forums, townhall meetings, and Q&A sessions with the community to answer questions about court operations, misperceptions about the legal system, and how the public can better access justice services.
3. **Media Communications and Public Relations** : Magistrates Court proactively engages the media in stories about important cases or justice system issues, provides access to information for journalists, and uses social media to share information about court services and institutional updates.
4. **Transparency and Accountability** : The court publishes detailed annual performance reports, case statistics, and information on operational challenges, all in language easily understood by the general public.

##### Lessons for the Judicial Commission

From the Magistrates Court experience, the Judicial Commission can learn about: the importance of integrating justice system education into the school curriculum; the benefits of direct engagement with the public through community forums; the strategic value of proactive media communications; and the importance of reporting institutional performance information in an easily understood format. The Magistrates Court engagement model demonstrates that systematic and sustained public engagement can significantly enhance institutional understanding and legitimacy [28].

#### 5.1.2 New Zealand Judicial Conduct Commissioner: Transparency and Accountability as the Foundation of Trust

##### Institutional Context and Mandate

The New Zealand Judicial Conduct Commissioner (JCC) has a mandate more similar to the Indonesian Judicial Commission because of its focus on overseeing the ethics and conduct of judges [29]. The JCC's experience in building institutional legitimacy through CSR initiatives provides highly relevant lessons.

##### Key CSR Initiatives

1. **Transparent Public Reports** : The JCC publishes highly detailed annual reports detailing: the number and types of complaints received, the results of investigations, decisions made (while maintaining the required confidentiality), and trend analyses. These reports are written in easy-to-understand language and include visuals that help the public understand complex data.
2. **Stakeholder Consultation Procedures** : The JCC regularly consults with legal professional organizations, human rights organizations, and community representatives regarding the development of policies, interpretations of ethical standards, and the potential impacts of institutional decisions.
3. **Responsive Communication** : The JCC has developed a responsive system to answer public questions regarding judicial ethical standards, investigative procedures, and how the public can report violations. This information is available in multiple formats and languages to ensure accessibility.
4. **Case Studies and Lessons Learned** : The JCC selectively publishes summaries of significant cases (while maintaining necessary confidentiality) to communicate to the public what is considered unacceptable behavior, what has been learned from specific cases, and how ethical standards are evolving.
- 5.

##### Lessons for the Judicial Commission

Publish by Radja Publiko



## **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

From the New Zealand JCC experience, the Judicial Commission can learn about: the importance of consistent transparency in performance reporting; the value of structured and ongoing stakeholder consultation; the benefits of prompt and friendly responsiveness to public inquiries; and the benefits of selective publication of lessons learned from significant cases to enhance public understanding of ethical standards. The JCC model demonstrates that carefully managed transparency and accountability can enhance public trust even in situations where institutions must make difficult or potentially unpopular decisions [30].

### **5.1.3 French Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature: Integration of CSR into the Reform of the Justice System Institutional Context and Strategic Approach**

The French Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature (CSM), as Europe's most influential judge oversight body, has integrated CSR principles into its broader approach to justice system reform and increased institutional accountability [31].

#### **Key CSR Initiatives**

1. **Public Engagement in Policy Development** : CSM has developed mechanisms to engage the public and civil society in consultations on the development of new policies on ethical standards, investigative procedures, and accountability mechanisms. This engagement is conducted through public forums, written submissions, and multi-stakeholder working groups.
2. **Comparative Research and Analysis** : CSM regularly conducts and publishes research on best practices in the oversight of judicial ethics in other jurisdictions, lessons learned from international experience, and recommendations for improving the French system.
3. **Training and Professional Development Programs** : CSM conducts comprehensive training programs not only for prospective judges but also for other government officials on the values of integrity, ethics, accountability, and social responsibility.
4. **Advocacy for System Reform** : CSM plays an active role in advocacy for broader justice system reforms, focusing not only on the ethical oversight of individual judges but also on structural issues in access to justice, system efficiency, and responsiveness to public needs.

#### **Lessons for the Judicial Commission**

From the experience of the French CSM, the Judicial Commission can learn about: the importance of integrating CSR into broader institutional reform strategies; the benefits of public engagement in developing policies; the value of comparative research and learning to identify best practices; and the importance of a more active role for oversight institutions in advocating for broader system reform. The CSM approach demonstrates that oversight institutions can contribute beyond traditional oversight functions to become a driver of positive change in justice systems as a whole [32].

## **5.2 Cross-Context Comparison: Similarities, Differences, and Learning**

### **5.2.1 Similarities in Challenges and Strategies**

Despite significant contextual differences between different jurisdictions, judicial oversight bodies across countries face similar challenges and have developed CSR strategies that share important similarities:

1. **Public Legitimacy Gap** : All institutions studied face the challenge that their oversight functions remain largely invisible or misunderstood by the wider public, resulting in a gap between formal mandates and perceived social impact.
2. **The Importance of Transparency** : All institutions have recognized that operational transparency—balanced with the need to maintain necessary confidentiality—is key to building public trust and institutional legitimacy.
3. **Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement** : All institutions have moved towards mechanisms to involve external stakeholders (professional organizations, civil society, the general public) in institutional decision-making processes and feedback.
4. **Public Education as a Priority** : All institutions have recognized the strategic value of investing in public education about the justice system and ethical standards as a way to increase public understanding, support, and participation.
5. **Proactive Communication** : All institutions have developed more proactive communication strategies beyond reactive press releases on specific cases.

## **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

### **5.2.2 Significant Contextual Differences**

On the other hand, there are also important differences that reflect different institutional contexts and socio-political environments:

1. **Initial Level of Public Trust** : The Australian Magistrates Court and New Zealand's JCC operate in the context of countries with relatively high levels of public trust in institutions, whereas the Indonesian Judicial Commission operates in a context where public trust in institutions, including the judicial system, has been eroded by a history of corruption and accountability problems [33].
2. **Institutional Resources and Capacity** : Institutions in developed countries have access to much more substantial resources to support CSR initiatives, whereas the Indonesian Judicial Commission operates under tighter budget constraints and must be more creative in mobilizing resources.
3. **Media and Digital Environment** : Countries such as Australia and New Zealand have more mature media infrastructure and higher digital penetration, facilitating broader institutional communication. Indonesia, despite its increasing digital capabilities, still faces challenges in the digital divide that results in substantial segments of the population being less digitally connected [34].
4. **Political Context and Power Relations** : The level of institutional autonomy, relations with other branches of government, and the broader political environment vary significantly between countries. In Indonesia, political dynamics may affect the Judicial Commission's freedom to communicate investigative findings or undertake certain CSR initiatives [35].

### **5.2.3 Implications for Adaptation in the Judicial Commission**

Lessons from international comparisons indicate that while the basic principles of CSR have universal relevance, practical implementation must be tailored to specific institutional, socio-cultural, and political contexts. For the Indonesian Judicial Commission, key implications include:

1. A strong commitment to transparency and accountability is an uncompromising foundation for building public trust, even under conditions of limited resources.
2. Public education should be prioritized as a long-term strategic investment to build public understanding and support for oversight functions.
3. Stakeholder engagement must be authentic and meaningful rather than cosmetic or performative, with real mechanisms for responding to stakeholder input.
4. Communication strategies must be adapted to the realities of Indonesian media, encompassing the use of both traditional and digital media, and taking into account variations in levels of digital accessibility across regions.
5. Partnerships with civil society organizations, legal aid organizations, and educational institutions can expand the reach and impact of CSR initiatives in the context of limited resources.
6. Institutional leadership must demonstrate a consistent and visible commitment to the values of transparency, accountability, and public responsiveness as a way to develop an organizational culture that supports CSR initiatives [36].

## **6. COMPREHENSIVE DISCUSSION: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES AND OVERCOME STRATEGIES**

### **6.1 Technical and Operational Challenges**

#### **6.1.1 Barriers to Transparency and Public Communication**

One of the main challenges in implementing a CSR model for the Judicial Commission is balancing the need for greater transparency with the legal requirement to maintain confidentiality in judicial ethics investigation processes. Investigative processes often involve sensitive information, accusations against individual judges that must be protected until a final conclusion is reached, and information that may concern the privacy or personal safety of the individuals involved [37].

#### **Coping Strategy :**

1. Development of clear communication protocols that define: what information can be communicated to the public at different stages of the investigative process; how information can be presented in ways that maintain individual confidentiality but provide transparency about the overall process; and review mechanisms to ensure that decisions about disclosure are consistent and justified.

# **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

---

2. Publication of aggregate reports on investigative patterns, statistics, and lessons learned from significant cases (without disclosing individual identities) as a way to provide transparency about what the institution is doing while protecting necessary confidentiality.
3. Consultation with legal academics, human rights organizations, and transparency institutions to develop a balanced framework for transparency that can be applied in the Indonesian legal context.

## **6.1.2 Institutional Capacity and Resources**

Implementing a comprehensive CSR model requires the allocation of substantial resources in terms of personnel, training, technology, and operational budgets [38]. The Judicial Commission, like many public institutions in developing countries, operates with a limited budget and limited ability to allocate new resources.

### **Coping Strategy :**

1. A gradual implementation starting with lower-cost CSR initiatives that can provide significant impact quickly, such as: improving institutional websites, publishing more informative performance reports, developing an active social media presence, and holding consultation forums at minimal cost through the use of public venues.
2. Developing strategic partnerships with universities, civil society organizations, and international donor agencies to share costs and resources in implementing specific initiatives. For example, partnerships with law schools can support the development of educational materials and the delivery of training programs more cost-effectively.
3. The creation of a dedicated CSR or public engagement unit within the Commission's organizational structure, albeit with a relatively small staff, responsible for the coordination and implementation of CSR initiatives, so that this function is not simply an additional responsibility for already overloaded staff.
4. Advocacy to policymakers and budget providers on the strategic benefits and long-term ROI of investing in CSR, demonstrated through evidence from international practices and modeling of potential impacts on institutional legitimacy and oversight effectiveness.

## **6.2 Political and Organizational Challenges**

### **6.2.1 Resistance from Internal Stakeholders**

Implementation of a more transparent CSR model involving external stakeholders may face resistance from some internal stakeholder segments, including Commission personnel who may be concerned that increased transparency and external scrutiny may reduce their privacy awareness or increase pressure in carrying out their functions [39].

More significantly, there may be resistance from judges and professional organizations of judges who may see the Commission's increased visibility as a threat to their judicial independence or institutional authority. There are concerns that more proactive CSR by the Commission could be seen as an attempt to strengthen the Commission's oversight authority or to communicate the Commission's decisions in ways that could be perceived as condescending or adversarial to the judicial profession [40].

### **Coping Strategy :**

1. Early and ongoing engagement with judges' organizations and legal professional associations to explain the benefits of the proposed CSR model, address specific concerns, and build shared ownership of the initiatives. This dialogue should emphasize that CSR is not about increasing pressure on individual judges but about building public trust in the justice system as a whole, which benefits all stakeholders.
2. Develop communications that emphasize the complementarity between the Commission's CSR initiatives and the judicial profession's commitment to integrity. For example, public education programs could be communicated as a joint effort by the judicial profession and the Commission to build public understanding of the ethical standards to which judges themselves are committed.
3. Creation of regular consultation mechanisms with judges' organizations in the development of CSR strategies and policies to ensure that their perspectives are taken into account and that CSR initiatives are designed in ways that minimize the potential for misunderstanding or antagonism.
4. Documentation and transparency regarding the positive impacts of CSR initiatives, such as increased public awareness of ethical standards, an increase in the quality of complaints received by the Commission (because the public is better informed about what constitutes an ethical violation), or an increase in the effectiveness of the Commission's recommendations due to wider acceptance of the importance of ethical standards.

## **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

### **6.2.2 Navigating the Political Environment and Power Dynamics**

Political dynamics in Indonesia may affect the autonomy of the Judicial Commission and its freedom to take certain initiatives or communicate findings in ways that are perceived as controversial [41]. There is a risk that CSR efforts to increase transparency and public engagement may attract political attention or be perceived as political in ways that could entangle the Commission in political rivalries.

#### **Coping Strategy :**

1. Focus on aspects of the CSR model that have cross-partisan support and can be communicated as being about better public service rather than specific political agendas. For example, public education about the justice system and transparency of institutional operations are difficult to contest from any political perspective.
2. Diversifying the external stakeholders involved in institutional dialogues ensures that the Commission is not perceived as being close to certain political parties or civil society organizations. Balanced engagement with a variety of organizations and perspectives can help position the Commission as serious about serving the public interest rather than pursuing political agendas.
3. Consistent documentation of the criteria and processes used in institutional decision-making to demonstrate that decisions are based on substantive legal and ethical grounds rather than on political considerations.
4. Proactive engagement with the media and civil society to counter potential distortions of institutional initiatives, ensuring that the public narrative about the Commission is based on evidence and an accurate understanding of what the institution does.

## **6.3 Measurement and Evaluation Framework**

### **6.3.1 Challenges in Measuring the Success of Institutional CSR**

Unlike corporate CSR where financial impacts can be measured relatively directly, measuring the success of CSR models for public institutions such as the Judicial Commission faces significant methodological challenges [42]. Concepts such as “institutional legitimacy”, “public trust”, and “oversight effectiveness” are multidimensional and difficult to measure objectively.

#### **Coping Strategy :**

1. Development of a mixed-methods measurement framework that combines quantitative and qualitative indicators:

#### **Quantitative Indicators :**

- Level of public awareness regarding the Judicial Commission (measured through regular public surveys)
- Engagement levels with the Commission's digital and social media platforms
- Number of participants in educational programs and consultation forums
- Number of complaints received from the public and the patterns of these complaints
- Metrics from website analytics and digital engagement
- Level of media coverage of judicial ethics issues

2. **Qualitative Indicators :**

- Stakeholder perceptions of the Commission's transparency and responsiveness (measured through focus groups and in-depth interviews)
- Expert assessments of the quality of CSR initiatives
- Narrative analyses of media coverage and public discourse regarding the Commission
- Case studies of the impact of specific programs
- Documentation of institutional lessons learned and adaptations of CSR strategies

3. Development of baseline measurements prior to implementation of the proposed CSR model so that changes can be attributed to CSR initiatives with more confidence.
4. Establishment of regular monitoring and cyclic evaluation (e.g., annual performance evaluation) with flexibility to adapt strategies based on findings from previous evaluations.
5. Involvement of independent external evaluators to ensure the objectivity and credibility of the evaluation processes.

### **6.3.2 Specific Indicators for Each CSR Dimension**

#### **First Dimension: Legal Education and Civil Awareness**

# BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)

Arif Budiman

- Percentage of the public who can identify the Judicial Commission and explain its functions (target: improvement from baseline)
- Number of students completing judicial ethics education programs (target: 20% annual growth)
- Level of satisfaction and knowledge retention of participants in educational programs (measured through pre- and post-tests, and follow-up assessments)
- The number of educational institutions that have integrated CSR and judicial ethics modules into their curriculum
- Level of engagement with digital learning platforms (page views, user registrations, content downloads, etc.)

## Second Dimension: Public Advocacy and Institutional Socialization

- The amount and reach of media coverage of judicial ethics issues and the work of the Commission
- Metrics from social media engagement (followers, likes, shares, comments)
- The Commission's level of brand awareness and favorability among the public (measured through surveys)
- Changes in public narratives about the Commission (analysis from discourse analysis)
- Reach and impact of thematic advocacy campaigns

## Third Dimension: Community Empowerment and Participatory Governance

- The level of participation of civil society organizations in consultation forums and co-production initiatives
- The amount and quality of feedback received from the community (analysis of the volume, substantiveness, and diversity of feedback)
- The Commission's level of responsiveness to feedback (measured as the percentage of feedback that receives a response within the promised timeframe and the quality of those responses)
- Community satisfaction levels with engagement processes (measured through feedback surveys)
- Number of initiatives or policies adapted based on community feedback

## 7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 7.1 Key Findings

This research has demonstrated that the principles of *Corporate Social Responsibility*, when carefully and thoughtfully adapted to the specific context of state regulatory institutions, offer a comprehensive and valuable framework for enhancing institutional legitimacy, meaningful public engagement, and the tangible social impact of ethical oversight efforts. The proposed three-dimensional CSR model—consisting of: (1) legal education and civic awareness, (2) public advocacy and institutional socialization, and (3) community empowerment through participatory governance—provides a concrete and actionable blueprint for the Judicial Commission to move beyond traditional, closed oversight functions toward a more open, transparent, responsive, and publicly engaging approach. Lessons from international comparative analysis show that while institutional and socio-political contexts differ, core principles for building public trust and institutional legitimacy—such as transparency, accountability, authentic stakeholder engagement, and public education—have universal relevance and can be contextually adapted to different jurisdictions. The identified implementation challenges—including technical, operational, and political barriers—are significant but not insurmountable. With thoughtful overcoming strategies, strategic partnerships, and commitment from institutional leadership, the Judicial Commission can implement this CSR model incrementally and sustainably.

### 7.2 Recommendations for Implementation

#### 7.2.1 Long-Term Strategic Recommendations

1. **Formal Adoption of the CSR Framework** : The Judicial Commission, through its leadership and governing board, should formally adopt the proposed three-dimensional CSR model as part of its long-term institutional strategy, with explicit commitment from all levels of leadership.
2. **Development of a Comprehensive Implementation Plan** : Development of a detailed implementation plan that identifies: specific priorities for each CSR dimension, a timeline for implementation, allocation of resources, responsibility assignments, and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation.
3. **Creation of a Dedicated Unit for CSR and Public Engagement** : Establishment of a dedicated unit or department within the Commission's organizational structure responsible for the coordination and

# **BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

implementation of CSR initiatives, with personnel with expertise in communications, public engagement, and stakeholder management.

4. **Integration of CSR into Institutional Performance Evaluation** : Incorporating CSR indicators into the Commission's annual performance evaluation framework, so that accountability for CSR targets is on par with accountability for core oversight functions.
5. **Advocacy for Supportive Regulatory Changes** : Advocate to policymakers for amendments or clarifications in the legal framework governing the Commission to explicitly recognize and support the CSR responsibilities of institutions.

## **7.2.2 Short-Term Operational Recommendations (1-2 Years)**

### **First Dimension: Legal Education and Civil Awareness**

1. Development and launch of an easily accessible online learning website on judicial ethics (with support for various regional languages if possible)
2. Establishment of partnerships with at least 5 leading law universities for the integration of judicial ethics modules into the curriculum
3. Organizing at least 4 community workshops in various geographic areas in the first year
4. Publication and dissemination of public guidelines on how to report violations of judicial ethics

### **Second Dimension: Public Advocacy and Institutional Socialization**

1. Publication of the first annual social accountability report using a user-friendly format and equipped with infographics
2. Launch of the Commission's official social media accounts with regular editorial content
3. Developing a media engagement strategy with a target of publishing at least 1-2 press releases per month on judicial ethics issues.
4. Holding a press conference once a year regarding updates on the Commission's performance

### **Third Dimension: Community Empowerment and Participatory Governance**

1. Establishment of regular (at least quarterly) stakeholder consultation forums with leading civil society organizations and legal professionals
2. Development of a more user-friendly online complaint system
3. Establishment of a community advisory group consisting of representatives from various community groups to provide strategic input
4. Holding at least 2 townhall meetings per year in strategic locations

## **7.2.3 Recommendations to Address Specific Challenges**

### **To Overcome Resource Constraints :**

1. Identify potential partners (universities, NGOs, international donors) who can co-support CSR initiatives.
2. Priority for high-impact but low-cost initiatives in the early stages
3. Advocacy to policy makers and parliament for a larger budget allocation for CSR

### **To Overcome Internal and External Resistance :**

1. Holding a series of dialogue sessions with internal and external stakeholders to build understanding and ownership
2. Documentation and dissemination of positive results from CSR initiatives to demonstrate the value proposition.
3. Inclusion of skeptical stakeholders in the process of developing initiatives to build buy-in

### **To Address Political Challenges :**

1. Framing of CSR initiatives in terms of public service and institutional excellence rather than political agenda
2. Maintenance of balanced engagement with various stakeholders and perspectives
3. Focus on aspects of CSR that have broad consensus and are difficult to contest politically.

## **REFERENCES**

[1] Trebilcock, M. J., Daniels, R. J., & Luco, R. V. (2012). *The role of courts*. Oxford University Press.

**BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

---

[2] Butt, S. (2015). The constitutional court and the judicial commission in Indonesia: Judicial independence, accountability and the lack of separation of powers. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 10(1), 1–34.

[3] Komisi Yudisial Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Laporan Tahunan 2023: Pengawasan Etika Hakim untuk Integritas Sistem Peradilan*. Komisi Yudisial RI.

[4] Butt, S., & Lindsey, T. (2012). Judicial mafia? The lower judiciary in Indonesia. In *Rule of law and the courts: Culture, politics and institutional change in Asia*. Routledge.

[5] Carroll, A. B., & Shabana, K. M. (2010). The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research and practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 85–105.

[6] Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B. L., & De Colle, S. (2010). Stakeholder capitalism: A view of the corporation in the 21st century. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(2), 305–314.

[7] Simanungkalit, I. H. (2024). Implementation of corporate social responsibility as a legal mandatory in Indonesia. *Dinamika Riset: Jurnal Penelitian*, 2(2), 45–62.

[8] Setiawati, D., & Nugroho, M. (2024). Transparency and accountability in corporate social responsibility: Local government oversight through a business law perspective. *Law and Justice*, 15(1), 112–135.

[9] Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610.

[10] Deephouse, D. L., & Suchman, M. (2008). Legitimacy in organizational institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *Organizational institutionalism* (pp. 49–77). Sage Publications.

[11] Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford University Press.

[12] Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4), 853–886.

[13] Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge University Press.

[14] Moore, M. H. (2013). *Recognizing public value*. Harvard University Press.

[15] Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945, Pasal 24B-24D.

[16] Makinwa, A., Oladimeji, S., & Alade, S. (2024). Public perception of judicial oversight institutions: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Judicial Administration*, 14(2), 78–95.

[17] Kim, S., & Lee, J. (2023). The role of institutional communication in building public trust. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 401–425.

[18] Survey on Judicial Commission Awareness. (2023). *Laporan Survei Kesadaran Publik tentang Komisi Yudisial*. [Unpublished research].

[19] Bovens, M., Goodin, R. E., & Schillemans, T. (Eds.). (2014). *The Oxford handbook of public accountability*. Oxford University Press.

[20] Florini, A. (2007). *The right to know: Transparency for an open world*. Columbia University Press.

[21] Williams, M. R., & Barrett, J. D. (2000). Corporate social responsibility and corporate governance. In *Corporate governance and accountability* (2nd ed., pp. 75–98). Blackwell Publishers.

[22] Bovaird, T., & Loeffler, E. (2016). From co-production to co-creation of public services: How citizens and public servants can work together. In *The Cambridge handbook of public administration and co-governance* (pp. 213–235).

[23] Stoker, G., & Evans, M. (2014). The political psychology of trust. In *Trust and democracy in the public sector* (pp. 45–67). Palgrave Macmillan.

[24] UNESCO. (2023). *Judicial literacy and public understanding of the law: A global imperative*. UNESCO Publishing.

[25] Pfetsch, B. (2018). *Political communication culture: Public discourse, media use, and democracy*. Oxford University Press.

[26] Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community co-production of public services. *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 846–860.

[27] Magistrates Court of Australia. (2024). *Community Engagement and Public Education Strategy 2024-2027*. [Institutional document].

[28] Asquith, N. L., & Pham, H. (2020). Access to justice and public trust in judicial institutions: Lessons from comparative experience. *Comparative Judicial Review*, 8(1), 34–52.

[29] Judicial Conduct Commissioner New Zealand. (2023). *Annual Report 2023*. New Zealand Government Publishing.

**BUILDING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS EXTERNAL OVERSEER OF JUDGES (DEVELOPING A CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MODEL FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION AS AN EXTERNAL SUPERVISOR OF JUDGES)**

Arif Budiman

---

- [30] Chapman, B., & Toutblanc, C. (2019). Building public trust in judicial oversight: Comparative perspectives. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 12(1), 45–61.
- [31] Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature. (2024). *Rapport d'Activités 2023: Transparence et Engagement Civique*. CSM France.
- [32] Garoupa, N., & Ginsburg, T. (2015). Judicial independence in new democracies: The business of courts. Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Thapar, R., & Viswanath, R. (2022). Trust in institutions: A comparative analysis of emerging democracies. *Asian Journal of Democratic Studies*, 19(3), 112–138.
- [34] Statistik, B. P. (2024). *Indikator Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Indonesia: Survei Akses dan Penggunaan Digital 2024*. Badan Pusat Statistik Republik Indonesia.
- [35] Butt, S. (2017). Judicial independence and democratization in Indonesia: The case of Komisi Yudisial. *Indonesia*, 105, 115–134.
- [36] Schillemans, T., & Bovens, M. (2011). The challenge of keeping autonomous public agencies accountable. *Administration & Society*, 43(5), 582–604.
- [37] UNODC. (2024). *Handbook on best practices in judicial ethics and transparency*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- [38] Kaufmann, D. (2005). Myths and realities of governance and corruption. *Governance*, 15(3), 1–16.
- [39] Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- [40] Przetacznik, F. (2022). Judicial independence and public accountability: Tensions and reconciliation. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 42(1), 78–101.
- [41] Schedler, A. (1999). Conceptualizing accountability. In A. Schedler, L. J. Diamond, & M. F. Plattner (Eds.), *The self-restraining state: Power and accountability in new democracies* (pp. 13–28). Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- [42] Etzioni, A. (2010). *The public interest: Common good versus private interest*. American Sociological Review, 73(1), 1–22.
- [43] Evolving Legal Frameworks of Corporate Social Responsibility in Southeast Asia. (2025). *International Journal of Corporate Theory*, 45(1), 23–58.
- [44] Prihatin, P. S. (2024). Evaluation of the implementation of corporate social responsibility policies: A case study from Dumai City. *Indonesian Administrative Studies*, 18(2), 156–178.
- [45] International Organization for Standardization. (2023). *ISO 26000:2023 Guidance on social responsibility*. International Organization for Standardization.