

## EFFECTIVENESS OF SOCIALIZATION AND CONSULTATION ON CONSUMER DISPUTE RESOLUTION BY BPSK CITY OF BANDUNG FOR MSMEs OF KADIN CITY OF BANDUNG

**Salamatul Afiyah**

*UIN Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung, Indonesia*

*Email: salamatul.afiyah@uinsgd.ac.id*

### Article History

Received: 12 January 2026

Accepted: 28 March 2026

Published: 11 April 2026

### Abstract

The low level of public knowledge regarding the functions, roles, and procedures of the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency (BPSK) often leads to suboptimal utilization of non-litigation dispute resolution channels; at this point, the need for educational interventions is quite urgent, especially for MSMEs that deal directly with the dynamics of consumer complaints on a daily basis. Departing from this context, this study is directed at assessing the effectiveness of the consumer dispute resolution socialization and consultation activities held by BPSK Bandung City on October 30, 2025, at the Bandung City Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KADIN). The theoretical framework combines the perspectives of public policy implementation, consumer protection literacy, and access to justice—a combination that, interestingly, allows the analysis not only to stop at "implemented activities" but also on their practical meaning for the ability of target actors to access available mechanisms. Methodologically, this study uses a qualitative approach with a case study design; data are collected through document analysis, semi-structured interviews, and limited observations, using Miles Huberman Saldaña's purposive sampling and interactive analysis techniques. The results indicate that the program proceeded in an orderly manner and fostered a more operational understanding of the complaint process, the BPSK's authority, and referrals for out-of-court dispute resolution. It is noteworthy that the multi-stakeholder format and consultation space strengthened the credibility of the message and built perceptions of justice at the initial access stage; however, evidence of long-term change still requires further testing. Therefore, the most plausible implication is the need for a more measurable impact evaluation to more robustly demonstrate program achievements.

**Keywords:** Access to Justice, BPSK, Consumer Protection Literacy.

### A. INTRODUCTION

Consumer protection in Indonesia, from a normative standpoint, indeed provides space for non-litigation dispute resolution, given that Article 45 paragraph (1) of Law No. 8 of 1999 grants aggrieved consumers the option to pursue claims against business actors either through dispute resolution bodies or through the general courts (Republic of Indonesia, 1999). Within this framework, the Consumer Dispute Settlement Agency (BPSK) is positioned as an out-of-court dispute resolution channel expected to be simpler, faster, and more affordable a design that is fundamentally pro-access. Nevertheless, institutional effectiveness does not automatically follow normative strength; it depends heavily on the extent to which the public understands the available procedures, rights, and mechanisms. Consequently, the notion of "access" does not merely refer to the existence of an institution, but also to the accessibility of information and the capacity of service users to navigate procedures correctly. At this

<http://jurnaldialektika.com/>

Publisher: Perkumpulan Ilmuwan Administrasi Negara Indonesia

P-ISSN: 1412-9736

E-ISSN: 2828-545X

juncture, consumer legal literacy becomes a key variable in determining whether BPSK truly functions as an instrument of protection or merely exists as a formal apparatus (Yuwono & Santiago, 2024).

A number of empirical studies present a fairly consistent picture that BPSK performance is often hampered by practical and structural implementation issues. For instance, regional-level research highlights recurring constraints limited human resources, inadequate facilities, and uneven socialization efforts which ultimately affect service quality and dispute resolution outcomes (Virgoria, Hamid, & Abdurrifai, 2025). Notably, these problems do not always stop at the operational level, as procedural issues and the execution of decisions have also been identified as not fully aligned with practical dynamics, resulting in BPSK decisions that are not always perceived as final or effective in providing protection (Hamid, Nur, & Mustari, 2025). At the same time, other studies indicate that although BPSK is viewed as offering a relatively inexpensive and rapid avenue, low levels of consumer legal awareness remain a major barrier to service utilization (Rosaria & Marpaung, 2022). In other words, BPSK occupies a somewhat paradoxical position: the instruments are available, yet the “knowledge bridge” required to access them is often insufficient.

In the Bandung context, activity reports from the Bandung City BPSK reveal a similar pattern, namely that many members of the public or consumers remain unaware of BPSK’s functions, roles, or even its existence; as a result, institutional education emerges as an urgent necessity (BPSK Kota Bandung, 2025). This finding is significant because it shifts the focus from normative debate to a more implementation-oriented question: what forms of intervention are most reasonable for closing this information gap, particularly among groups that interact most intensively with the market, such as MSMEs. Responding to this need, the Bandung City BPSK conducted a consumer dispute resolution socialization and consultation activity on 30 October 2025 at the Bandung Chamber of Commerce, involving 60 MSME participants as the target group for strengthening understanding of non-litigation mechanisms (BPSK Kota Bandung, 2025). Substantively, this activity can be read as a policy instrument aimed at enhancing procedural literacy not merely introducing the institution, but also teaching how to use it. Accordingly, the development of your research article would be more incisive if it were directed toward assessing the extent to which the design of this socialization-consultation program genuinely produces operational understanding and encourages MSMEs’ access to BPSK services (BPSK Kota Bandung, 2025).

BPSK was established in response to the need for consumer dispute resolution that is fast, low-cost, and not necessarily conducted through the courts. In practice, the design of consumer dispute resolution in Indonesia indeed positions BPSK as one of the primary non-litigation forums, particularly for disputes that demand simpler access to justice for both consumers and business actors. Comparative studies on BPSK’s authority affirm that the institution is conceived as a strategic non-litigation mechanism for resolving consumer disputes, although the boundaries of its authority remain a frequently debated issue. As transactions and potential disputes increase including in the modern trade sector the strengthening of dispute resolution institutions becomes increasingly important so that consumer protection mechanisms are not only normatively robust but also tangibly effective in practice. Therefore, BPSK should be understood not merely as an “additional option,” but as an integral component of the consumer protection architecture that requires adequate institutional support and public literacy (Wahidi et al., 2023; Situmorang, 2022).

Institutionally, BPSK is often understood as a “quasi-judicial” body in the sense that it performs dispute resolution functions through specific procedures, issues decisions, and operates within the legal framework of consumer protection. However, a number of studies indicate that BPSK-related issues extend beyond the mere “existence” of the institution to

encompass clarity of mandate, consistency of authority, and the appropriateness of the types of disputes handled. When jurisdictional boundaries are not uniformly understood for example, in disputes that more closely resemble general civil breach-of-contract cases the resolution process may generate uncertainty for the parties involved. At this point, strengthening BPSK governance becomes crucial to ensure that the institution remains credible as an out-of-court dispute resolution channel and does not become entangled in jurisdictional contestation. In other words, BPSK's effectiveness is strongly shaped by the clarity of its mandate and its institutional capacity to exercise authority appropriately (Wahidi et al., 2023).

**Translation (Academic English):**

A problem that is often overlooked is that the effectiveness of the Consumer Dispute Settlement Agency (BPSK) is highly dependent on public knowledge: an institution may exist, but it will not be utilized if the public does not understand how to access it. Survey-based research indicates that although more than half of respondents recognize BPSK as a consumer protection body, many still lack an adequate understanding of its roles, duties, and, most importantly, its authority. This finding is significant because it reveals a gap between "surface knowledge" (knowing the name of the institution) and "operational knowledge" (understanding complaint procedures, authority, and processes), which ultimately determines whether consumers will actually use dispute resolution services. This condition explains why socialization and public education are not merely ceremonial activities, but policy interventions that directly shape the effectiveness of consumer protection. When institutional literacy is low, consumer protection weakens at the implementation stage, even when the regulatory framework is already in place (Suherman et al., 2023).

Beyond challenges related to public literacy, the effectiveness of BPSK is also influenced by procedural barriers and operational constraints in dispute resolution. Studies on BPSK Jakarta highlight that conciliation processes are often perceived as less effective due to issues such as cases falling outside BPSK's jurisdiction, the absence of disputing parties, relatively lengthy procedures, and limited facilities, all of which can undermine the goal of simple and efficient dispute resolution. These findings align with studies emphasizing the need for regulatory refinement and institutional strengthening to prevent the consumer dispute settlement function from being weakened by structural problems and administrative practices. In other words, BPSK faces challenges on two fronts simultaneously: the "demand side" (limited public understanding) and the "service supply side" (processes and institutional capacity that are not always effective). Therefore, efforts to enhance the quality of BPSK services must be pursued in parallel with the expansion of consumer and business literacy (Enggraini & Suherman, 2022; Sitepu & Muhamad, 2021).

Within this context, socialization and consultation programs represent a logical strategy, as they help close literacy gaps while simultaneously building public trust in non-litigation dispute resolution mechanisms. Policy recommendations from studies on the effectiveness of dispute resolution institutions consistently stress the importance of strengthening BPSK's capacity and role so that it can resolve disputes quickly and at low cost, particularly as the nature of consumer disputes evolves in line with modern transaction patterns. Thus, socialization efforts should not merely introduce BPSK, but also guide the public, including MSMEs, to understand when and how BPSK can be utilized and what outcomes can realistically be expected from the dispute resolution process. When socialization is designed in a user-oriented manner and followed by practical consultation, such interventions have the potential to enhance access to justice while reinforcing institutional effectiveness. From this perspective, socialization and consultation activities become an integral component of

consumer protection implementation, rather than a routine annual agenda (Suherman et al., 2023; Situmorang, 2022).

Therefore, in the implementation of the Work Program of the Consumer Dispute Settlement Agency (BPSK) of Bandung City, the BPSK of Bandung City for the 2025 Fiscal Year carried out Socialization and Consultation Activities on Consumer Dispute Settlement for the public. On 30 October 2025, the Consumer Dispute Settlement Agency (BPSK) conducted Socialization and Consultation on Consumer Dispute Settlement at the Bandung City Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KADIN).

## **B. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Public Policy Implementation**

Public policy implementation refers to the process of translating policy objectives, norms, and instruments into concrete actions that can be directly experienced by target groups. The success of implementation is determined not only by the clarity of regulations, but also by the capacity of implementers, the availability of resources, policy communication, and the level of acceptance among policy targets. In the context of public service delivery, implementation is understood as a dynamic interaction among government actors, non-government actors, and the community, which collectively shape actual policy outcomes. Socialization and consultation activities can be positioned as implementative instruments to ensure that policies do not remain at a purely normative level, but are instead understood and utilized by the public. Therefore, policy implementation provides a relevant theoretical framework for assessing the extent to which BPSK's socialization program is able to bridge the gap between the design of consumer protection policy and its practical application in the field (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1984; Hill & Hupe, 2021). Indicators of Policy Implementation:

- Clarity of policy objectives and substance
- Capacity and roles of policy implementers
- Mechanisms of policy communication and socialization
- Responsiveness and understanding of target groups
- Alignment between implementation and policy objectives

### **Consumer Protection Literacy**

Consumer protection literacy refers to the level of understanding possessed by individuals or business actors regarding their rights, obligations, and the mechanisms of legal protection in consumption and production activities. This literacy encompasses not only normative knowledge of regulations, but also procedural understanding of how to access consumer protection institutions and resolve disputes. An adequate level of consumer protection literacy enables consumers and business actors to make more rational, fair, and balanced decisions within market relationships. Low levels of consumer protection literacy are often a primary reason why institutionally available dispute resolution mechanisms remain underutilized. Accordingly, BPSK socialization activities can be understood as a strategy to enhance consumer protection literacy, particularly among MSMEs, so that they are able to understand, use, and trust the consumer dispute resolution system (OECD, 2020; Xiao & O'Neill, 2018).

Indicators of Consumer Protection Literacy:

- Knowledge of consumer rights and obligations
- Understanding of the functions and authority of BPSK
- Understanding of complaint submission and dispute resolution procedures
- Awareness of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms outside the courts
- Ability to identify and respond to consumer disputes

## **Access to Justice**

Access to justice refers to the ability of individuals or groups to obtain legal protection and fair, effective, and affordable dispute resolution. This concept emphasizes that the mere existence of legal institutions is insufficient if members of the public are unaware of them, do not understand how they function, or are unable to access them in practice. In the context of consumer disputes, access to justice includes the availability of non-litigation mechanisms that are fast, low-cost, and procedurally simple. Institutions such as the Consumer Dispute Settlement Body (BPSK) are positioned as instruments for expanding access to justice, particularly for vulnerable groups such as consumers and micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs). Accordingly, socialization and consultation activities can be understood as structural efforts to broaden access to justice by reducing informational, procedural, and psychological barriers in the resolution of consumer disputes (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978; Sandefur, 2019). Indicators of Access to Justice:

- Availability of information on dispute resolution mechanisms
- Procedural simplicity in submitting disputes
- Affordability of dispute resolution services
- Perceptions of institutional fairness and neutrality
- Trust in non-litigation dispute resolution mechanisms

## **C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design and Approach**

This study adopts a qualitative approach with a case study design to examine the implementation of consumer dispute resolution socialization and consultation activities conducted by the Consumer Dispute Settlement Body (Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen BPSK) of Bandung City. The choice of a qualitative approach is grounded in the study's need to closely capture the dynamics of policy implementation, participants' experiences, and the institutional context framing the activities, rather than merely testing causal relationships through numerical analysis. Notably, in studies that originate from activity reports often characterized as "administrative narratives" analytical strength tends to emerge when researchers can explain how a program is implemented and why particular outcomes are claimed to have been achieved. Within this framework, the case study design is particularly relevant because it allows the researcher to examine contemporary phenomena in their real-life context while linking field findings to more substantive explanations of processes and their consequences. It is also important to note that this design provides room to integrate multiple sources of evidence (documents, interviews, and observations), ensuring that activity reports do not stand alone but are enriched through stronger empirical verification. For these reasons, this approach is considered the most appropriate for analyzing BPSK socialization as an instrument of consumer protection policy and its implications for consumer protection literacy and access to justice (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Yin, 2018).

### **Data Collection Techniques**

Data were collected using a multi-source approach to enhance interpretive depth while simultaneously strengthening the credibility of the findings. First, the study employed document analysis, with reports of BPSK socialization and consultation activities serving as the core documents, complemented by supporting materials such as event agendas, attendance lists, socialization materials, and activity documentation. This step is crucial because documents not only provide information about what was done, but also reveal how the activities were framed from stated objectives to outcome claims articulated by the organizers. Second, to capture experiential and interpretive dimensions that do not always surface in documents, the study conducted semi-structured interviews with selected

informants, particularly to explore their perceptions of material clarity, understanding of BPSK mechanisms, and perceived access barriers in practice. The semi-structured format was chosen because, while it offers a guided question framework, it allows for further exploration when unanticipated yet substantively important issues arise. Third, the study incorporated limited observation, primarily through the review of visual documentation and activity notes, to capture interaction dynamics during socialization and consultation such as forms of participation, question-and-answer patterns, or the consultative atmosphere that may not be explicitly articulated. The combination of these three techniques enables source triangulation, which in turn enhances the robustness of interpretations against single-source bias (Yin, 2018; Creswell & Poth, 2018).

### **Sampling Technique**

The sampling technique employed was purposive sampling, involving the deliberate selection of informants based on the relevance of their experiences and knowledge to the phenomenon under study. Informants comprised three main groups: (1) organizers or parties directly involved in implementing the activities, (2) resource persons/speakers delivering substantive content on consumer protection and BPSK mechanisms, and (3) participants from the MSME sector who attended the socialization and/or consultation sessions. To avoid overly homogeneous perspectives, the selection of MSME participants considered relevant variations, such as type of business, length of operation, and prior experience with consumer disputes (whether or not they had previously encountered disputes). This variation strategy helps the researcher identify general patterns while also capturing important differences across cases within the same case. In practice, the number of informants was not determined solely by a fixed numerical target, but followed the principle of data saturation when additional interviews no longer yielded meaningful new themes or analytically enriching information. Such an approach is common in qualitative research, as it prioritizes data adequacy and depth over sample size (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

### **Data Analysis Technique**

Data analysis was conducted using the interactive analysis model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, which pragmatically guides researchers to move back and forth between data, themes, and interpretations until defensible conclusions are reached. The first stage involves data condensation, namely the process of selecting, focusing, and reducing interview and document data to ensure relevance to the research focus; at this stage, initial codes are developed and recurring meaning units are organized. The second stage, data display, is carried out by constructing matrices or thematic maps that connect empirical evidence with the theoretical framework particularly indicators of public policy implementation, consumer protection literacy, and access to justice thereby making the relationships between data and concepts more transparent. The third stage, conclusion drawing and verification, is conducted iteratively by comparing data across sources, testing the consistency of findings, and revisiting interpretations when anomalies or inconsistencies emerge. Importantly, to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, the study applies source triangulation, peer debriefing, and the maintenance of an audit trail so that analytical decisions can be systematically traced. Overall, this model is selected because it offers a structured yet flexible analytical framework and is therefore widely used in policy studies and program evaluations that require careful contextual interpretation (Miles et al., 2014; Yin, 2018).

## **D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Implementation of the Consumer Dispute Resolution Socialization Policy**



Figure 1. Dispute Resolution Socialization  
Source: Processed by Researchers, 2025

The implementation of the consumer dispute resolution socialization policy in this activity is best understood as a response to an informational policy gap. While consumer protection mechanisms are formally available, they are not automatically understood by the public as service users. It is noteworthy that the research confirms a gap in public/consumer knowledge regarding the function, role, and even the existence of the BPSK in Bandung, particularly among groups with more limited access to information in rural/rural areas. Therefore, strengthening understanding is deemed necessary, including procedural aspects, namely the procedures for dispute resolution through the BPSK. From an implementation perspective, this finding is important because policies do not essentially "work" simply because their legal basis is clear; they are only effective when information, procedural understanding, and access channels truly reach the target group adequately. Interestingly, the program rationale in the research also links the activities to the consumer protection mandate and positions the BPSK as an out-of-court dispute resolution mechanism. Therefore, socialization can be read as an implementation instrument that transforms "normative rights" into "practical capabilities" at the community level. In terms of design, the event was held on October 30, 2025, from 9:00–11:00 a.m. WIB (Western Indonesian Time) at the Bandung City Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Kadin), with 60 MSME participants. This was a strategic target group, as MSMEs occupy a dual position: as business actors obligated to understand consumer protection provisions, and as parties interacting intensively with consumers in daily transactions. The presentation was conducted through a multi-stakeholder configuration (government, consumers, and business actors), which, in practice, tended to increase the credibility of the message because participants gained a more balanced perspective on rights, obligations, and the risk of disputes.

This inconsistency may appear administrative, but for the research article, it is relevant because it impacts the accuracy of the implementation context, from mapping regional actors and spatial targets to opportunities for program replication. It also signals that the quality of implementation is often determined by the precision of activity recording. At the output level, the event demonstrated efforts to encourage target engagement through a question-and-answer/consultation mechanism, where participants were given space to ask questions after the presentation.

This study also indicates an increase in participants' knowledge, insight, and understanding regarding consumer dispute resolution and the role of the BPSK outside the courts, accompanied by institutional encouragement to implement similar activities again. However, for the purposes of scientific "results and discussion," this claim of improvement would be stronger if supported by analytical evidence, such as grouping consultation questions, follow-up interviews, or tracing post-activity service access, so that

implementation assessments focus not only on smooth implementation but also on changes in capacity and service access behavior among the target group.

### **Implementation of Consumer Protection Literacy**



Figure 2. Presentation of Material by Business Actors  
Source: Processed by Researchers, 2025

The finding that the material was delivered by business actors can be considered a substantive component of implementation, not simply a variation of speakers. It is noteworthy that the activity design included government, consumer, and business actors as resource persons, so that the material delivery did not proceed from a "single voice" logic from the authorities alone, but rather incorporated a more balanced perspective.

The involvement of business actors is important because it brings practical insights, from transaction experiences and service standards to complaint dynamics, which are often not fully captured when outreach is delivered solely from the regulator's perspective. Interestingly, this format also opens up opportunities for policy learning at the target level: consumer protection literacy does not stop at understanding consumer rights, but moves to understanding obligations, service governance, and the consequences of disputes from the provider's perspective, so that market relations can be built more equitably and realistically in the context of everyday transactions.

These findings align with previous research showing that business actors' legal sensitivity is still often a weak point in consumer protection implementation. Gijoh (2025), for example, showed that service sector business actors' understanding of the Consumer Protection Law tends to be at a "moderate" level, but there are still gaps in the implementation of more comprehensive protections (e.g., warranties or compensation), as well as a tendency to rely on internal mediation rather than utilizing formal channels like the BPSK. A critical look at these findings suggests that the presence of business actors in literacy sessions is not merely a matter of representation, but rather a strategy to encourage the internalization of protection standards at the practical level. In other words, material from business actors can be understood as an intervention on the "supply side" so that dispute resolution mechanisms are not merely within consumers' knowledge but also become procedures that are understood, recognized, and, to some extent, supported by business actors as part of service governance.

Furthermore, literature on consumer empowerment in Indonesia shows that the main problem is often rooted in low public knowledge about regulations, protection institutions, and the complaint culture; consequently, consumer education is more effective when designed as a cross-actor effort, including the private sector. Satory et al. (2020) emphasize that the low Consumer Empowerment Index is related to limited knowledge of regulations/institutions and

an underdeveloped complaint culture, while also demonstrating the importance of multi-institutional involvement in empowerment programs.

Akbar et al. (2023) even indicated that weaknesses in consumer empowerment are often apparent in the post-purchase phase, for example, in the tendency to voice experiences/complaints, necessitating the strengthening of more accessible education and complaint channels. Meanwhile, Rahmah et al. (2023) showed that public awareness of consumer protection agency programs remains relatively low and requires more intensive institutional awareness activities. In this context, your findings regarding speakers from business actors can be sharpened as an argument that multi-stakeholder designs have the potential to accelerate literacy while strengthening the dispute resolution ecosystem, not only by increasing awareness but also by building legitimacy, perspective alignment, and procedural readiness on both sides of the consumer-business relationship.

### **Implementing Justice for Consumers**



Figure 3. Strengthening Procedural Justice through Queue Management and Participant Administration in BPSK Activities

Source: Processed by Researchers, 2025

At the practical level, the existence of clear procedures, such as queue management, the availability of forms, and easy-to-follow service flows, tends to reduce uncertainty and, at the same time, strengthen users' confidence that the process is consistent and not "preferential." It is worth noting that this procedural dimension is often the initial foundation for perceptions of fairness, especially when the public enters a service that some may find new and risky. Meanwhile, face-to-face assistance conveys equally important interactional signals: respect, attention, and a willingness to help, which in many contexts are central to the assessment of "fairness or unfairness" from a user perspective. Interestingly, the combination of orderly procedures and supportive interactions suggests that socialization policies operate not solely on the information dimension, but also on the service experience dimension, namely how the public is "introduced" to dispute resolution mechanisms in an orderly, understandable, and relatively humane manner.

However, this pattern does not always align with the portrait often depicted in consumer justice literature on complaints situations in the marketplace. Classic studies illustrate that complaint handling experiences are often considered disappointing when consumers encounter complicated procedures, lack empathy in communication, or perceive inadequate outcomes. Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998) even showed that many customers who filed complaints remained dissatisfied with the treatment they received. Similarly, Blodgett, Hill, and Tax (1997) emphasized that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice influence post-complaint behavior, including repurchase intentions and negative word-of-mouth, suggesting that unfairness in both the process and outcome of complaint

handling tends to have both social and reputational costs for service providers. Reading these two references side by side, the findings about streamlined registration procedures and direct assistance can be understood as an interesting empirical contradiction: rather than reproducing patterns of complaint handling often perceived as unfair, these activities actually exhibit elements that—at least in the initial phase—bring the service closer to the principle of fairness.

However, this distinction needs to be interpreted with caution because the contexts are not entirely identical. Much consumer justice research examines fairness at the moment when consumers are already in a conflict situation or experiencing loss due to a service/product failure. Therefore, evaluations of fairness are typically determined not only by the process but also by the outcome (compensation, restitution, or form of decision) and repeated experiences over time. Maxham and Netemeyer (2002), for example, showed that perceptions of fairness dynamically influence satisfaction and behavioral intentions after complaint handling, suggesting that fairness can change over subsequent interactions and outcomes. This means that your findings are best positioned as fairness-at-entry at the initial access stage and do not necessarily reflect fairness at the final resolution stage. Therefore, your paper would be much stronger if it included further evidence, such as post-activity case tracking, assessments of satisfaction with the process, and perceptions of fairness regarding the outcome of the dispute resolution, so that the argument goes beyond the “service entry experience” and also touches on more substantive consequences.

## **E. CONCLUSION**

It can be concluded that the Consumer Dispute Resolution Socialization and Consultation activity by the Bandung City Consumer Protection Agency (BPSK), held on October 30, 2025, at the Bandung City Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KADIN), with 60 MSME participants, proceeded smoothly and was generally effective in achieving its primary objective: strengthening participants' knowledge, insight, and understanding of consumer dispute resolution mechanisms and the BPSK's position as a channel for out-of-court dispute resolution. Interestingly, this effectiveness was not solely evident in the smooth implementation, but also in the indication that participants gained a more operational understanding of "what to do" when a dispute arises. This activity can be interpreted as a concrete effort to reduce the information gap (policy gap) that often prevents normative consumer protection rights from remaining at the textual level, failing to translate into procedural capacity that can be put into practice by business actors.

It is noteworthy that the activity's design, involving government, consumer, and business actors, lends greater credibility because the message is not presented from a single perspective but rather appears more balanced, especially during the question-and-answer/consultation session, which provides participants with space to test their understanding, clarify cases, and map out referral steps directly. The relatively distinct contribution of this paper lies in its assertion that the quality of the initial access experience (e.g., a smooth service flow, clear procedures, and direct assistance) can be positioned as fairness-at-entry, strengthening perceptions of justice and public trust in the service before the dispute is further processed; in other words, socialization activities are understood not only as information transfer but also as strengthening the prerequisites for access to justice. However, it must be acknowledged that claims of “increased understanding” still stand out more as statements of activity results than as evidence of measurable and sustainable change. Therefore, it is practically recommended that BPSK-KADIN prepare follow-up in the form of periodic consultation clinics or case referral channels, expand the target group to groups with more limited access to information, and add simple evaluations (e.g., pre-post tests, grouping

of question themes, and tracking post-activity service access) to provide stronger evidence of achievement. Furthermore, follow-up research would be more robust if it used a mixed-method and longitudinal approach to assess whether increased literacy actually affects complaint behavior and dispute resolution outcomes. Meanwhile, from a policy perspective, standardization of materials and SOPs, accompanied by strengthening capacity and the quality of program recording/monitoring, is important so that cross-regional replication does not merely "repeat activities", but actually produces accountable consumer protection performance.

## REFERENCES

- Akbar, M. F., Valeriani, D., Wilujeng, P. R., & Tohari, M. (2023). *Assessing consumer empowerment and influencing factors in Central Bangka Regency: A multidimensional approach*. *Jurnal Perspektif Pembiayaan dan Pembangunan Daerah*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.22437/ppd.v11i1.21730>
- Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen (BPSK) Kota Bandung. (2025). *Laporan kegiatan sosialisasi dan konsultasi penyelesaian sengketa konsumen*. Bandung: BPSK Kota Bandung.
- Cappelletti, M., & Garth, B. (1978). Access to justice: The newest wave in the worldwide movement to make rights effective. *Buffalo Law Review*, 27(2), 181. [digitalcommons.law.buffalo.edu+1](https://digitalcommons.law.buffalo.edu/1)
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications
- Enggraini, S. D., & Suherman. (2022). Efektivitas penyelesaian sengketa oleh Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen (BPSK) Jakarta melalui proses konsiliasi. *Reformasi Hukum*, 26(1), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.46257/jrh.v26i1.393>
- Gijoh, S. A. G. (2025). *Awareness and implementation of consumer protection law in the service sector of Tomohon: Kesadaran dan implementasi Undang-Undang Perlindungan Konsumen di sektor jasa Kota Tomohon*. *Santhet (Jurnal Sejarah Pendidikan dan Humaniora)*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.36526/santhet.v9i3.5575>
- Hamid, A. H., Nur, M., & Mustari, R. (2025). *Optimization of consumer dispute resolution tasks by the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency of Makassar City*. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 8(2), 70–77. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijls.20250802.11> [Science Publishing Group](https://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/)
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2021). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications. [Google Buku+1](https://books.google.com/books?id=...)
- Kementerian Perdagangan Republik Indonesia. (2020). *Peraturan Menteri Perdagangan No. 72 Tahun 2020 tentang Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen*. Jakarta: Kemendag RI.
- Kementerian Perdagangan Republik Indonesia. (2017). *Peraturan Menteri Perdagangan Nomor 06/M-DAG/PER/2/2017 tentang Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen* (Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2017 Nomor 291).
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland; or, why it's amazing that federal programs work at all* (3rd ed.). University of California Press. [University of California Press+1](https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520083393)
- Rahmah, M., Simanjuntak, M., Sari, A. M., & Johan, I. R. (2023). *The study of program and roles of National Consumer Protection Agency using qualitative and quantitative approaches*. *Journal of Child, Family, and Consumer Studies*, 2(3), 209–222. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jcfcs.2.3.209-222>

- Republik Indonesia. (1999). *Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1999 tentang Perlindungan Konsumen*. Jakarta: Pemerintah RI
- Republik Indonesia. (2001). *Keputusan Presiden No. 90 Tahun 2001 tentang pembentukan BPSK*. Jakarta: Pemerintah RI.
- Republik Indonesia. (2001). *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 58 Tahun 2001 tentang Pembinaan dan Pengawasan Penyelenggaraan Perlindungan Konsumen* (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2001 Nomor 103, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4126).
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah*.
- Rosaria, J. N., & Marpaung, D. S. H. (2022). Efektivitas penyelesaian sengketa konsumen oleh Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen (BPSK) melalui mediasi dan arbitrase. *Jurnal Justitia*, 9(3), 1180–1188. <https://doi.org/10.31604/justitia.v9i3.1180-1188> [Jurnal UM-Tapsel](#)
- Sandefur, R. L. (2019). Access to what? *Daedalus*, 148(1), 49–55. [https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED\\_a\\_00534](https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_00534) [Illinois Experts](#)
- Satory, A., Sihombing, L. A., Nuraeni, Y., & Mustaqim, M. (2020). *Analysis of program implementation education of consumer protection in improving consumer empowerment index*. Atlantis Press.
- Sitepu, R. I., & Muhamad, H. (2021). Efektifitas Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen (BPSK) sebagai lembaga penyelesaian sengketa konsumen di Indonesia. *Jurnal Rechten: Riset Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 3(2), 7–14. <https://rechten.nusaputra.ac.id/index.php/rechten/article/download/79/67/418>
- Situmorang, M. (2022). Measuring the effectiveness of consumer dispute resolution on small value e-commerce transaction. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 22(4), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2022.V22.537-550> [lawpolicyjournal.id](#)
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Behavioural insights and organisations*. OECD Publishing. [https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/04/behavioural-insights-and-organisations\\_3b0933c2/e6ef217d-en.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/04/behavioural-insights-and-organisations_3b0933c2/e6ef217d-en.pdf)
- Suherman, N. A., Simanjuntak, M., Sari, A. M., & Johan, I. R. (2023). The study of consumer dispute resolution agency (BPSK) and non-governmental organization for consumer protection (LPKSM). *Journal of Child, Family, and Consumer Studies*, 2(3), 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jcfcs.2.3.257-269>
- Virgoria, A. P. A., Hamid, A. H., & Abdurrafai, A. (2025). Efektivitas penyelesaian sengketa konsumen melalui mediasi pada Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen di Kota Makassar. *Clavia Journal*, 23(1), Article 5651. <https://doi.org/10.56326/clavia.v23i1.5651> [Universitas Bosowa](#)
- Xiao, J. J., & O'Neill, B. (2016). Consumer financial education and financial capability. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12285> [Wiley Online Library](#)
- Wahidi, A., Mustaklima, M., & Jannani, N. (2023). The authority of Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen (BPSK) and Tribunal Tuntutan Pengguna Malaysia (TTPM) in consumer dispute resolution. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 23(1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2023.v23.87-100> [lawpolicyjournal.id](#)
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Yuwono, M. S., & Santiago, F. (2024). *Effectiveness of consumer dispute resolution through the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency (BPSK). International Journal of Law and Society, 1(6)*, Article 1827. <https://doi.org/10.70177/ijmsa.v1i6.1827>