

## **The Role of Social Advocacy in Addressing Social Inequality in Low-Income Communities**

**Sumitro<sup>1</sup>, Annisa Sukma<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Indonesia

Correspondence: [sumitro70@gmail.com](mailto:sumitro70@gmail.com)

---

### **Article Info**

#### **Article history:**

Received Jun 12<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Revised Nov 20<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Accepted Jan 26<sup>th</sup>, 2025

---

#### **Keyword:**

Social advocacy; social inequality; low-income communities; public service access; collaborative governance

---

### **ABSTRACT**

This study examines the role of social advocacy in mitigating social inequality among low-income urban communities, with a focus on disparities in access to welfare and essential services. Employing a qualitative approach through an in-depth case study design, the research enables a comprehensive understanding of advocacy dynamics and interactions among stakeholders involved in social decision-making. The investigation was conducted in the densely populated urban settlement “Sinar Jaya,” which reflects conditions of structural poverty and limited access to basic public services. Twelve key informants were selected through purposive sampling, consisting of social workers, NGO activists, local government officials, and community members who possess direct experience in advocacy processes. The findings reveal that collaborative social advocacy significantly bridges the gap between community needs and governmental policy responses by fostering dialogue, empowerment, and improvements in basic services. Advocacy initiatives enhanced access to healthcare, social assistance, and neighborhood facilities. The study suggests strengthening advocacy institutions, improving social worker capacities, and expanding strategic partnerships between government and non-government actors to ensure sustainable responses to urban social inequality.



© 2025 The Authors. Published by PT. KARYA GRAFINDO PRIMA PERKASA. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Social advocacy has increasingly emerged as a critical strategy to respond to persistent patterns of inequality experienced by low-income populations, especially those living in economically vulnerable and densely populated urban settings (Looby et al. 2023). Widening disparities in welfare outcomes highlight the persistent gap between the lived realities of poor households and policy interventions that often fail to address underlying structural causes (Drimie 2025). Within this context, social advocacy is conceptualized as coordinated efforts intended to influence policy decisions, strengthen community capacities, and mobilize social actors to defend fundamental rights. Advocacy becomes particularly relevant when state agencies confront constraints in institutional sensitivity, resource allocation, responsiveness, and coordination needed to meet the needs of marginalized groups (Ajmani et al. 2023). Collaborative forms of advocacy, involving social workers, civil society organizations, and local governments, represent an alternative model of intervention that seeks to build responsive and adaptive mechanisms to evolving social issues in urban communities (Димов et al. 2025).

Over the last two decades, scholarship on social advocacy has expanded significantly within the fields of social welfare, community practice, and public policy analysis. Much of the existing body of knowledge focuses on advocacy effectiveness in shaping macro-level policies, examining the role of NGOs as agents of social change, and identifying participatory strategies that enhance community empowerment (Sylvestre 2025). However, empirical analysis that explicitly links advocacy practices to the structural injustices faced by low-income groups remains limited, particularly studies that explore how cross-sector actors negotiate shared responsibilities in addressing inequalities in access to essential public services (Ahmed and Uddin 2025). Furthermore, several previous studies examine advocacy primarily from normative or policy perspectives without providing grounded evidence about the

dynamic processes that unfold within specific urban communities. Such gaps create space for developing studies that situate advocacy as a socially embedded process shaped by negotiation, power relations, and evolving interactions among actors within rapidly changing urban socio-political environments (Mitchell 2024).

The central problem addressed in this study arises from persistent disparities in service access between poor urban residents and the ability of public systems to respond to their needs adequately and equitably. Persistent inequalities in education, healthcare, adequate housing, and social protection demonstrate the structural barriers confronting low-income groups (Mzinyane et al. 2024). At the same time, communities often struggle to articulate needs or claim their rights through formal institutional mechanisms due to weak representation, limited access to information, and underdeveloped organizational structures (Clore, Agrawal, and Rethy 2023). The shortage of qualified social workers equipped with advocacy skills further constrains support mechanisms for these populations. Although various government initiatives have attempted to address these challenges, implementation has often been hampered by coordination gaps, limited resource support, fragmented institutional roles, and the absence of a comprehensive advocacy model that integrates welfare-oriented approaches across sectors (Guarcello 2024).

A systematic review of the literature reveals a research gap concerning collaborative advocacy that simultaneously involves social workers, community organizations, and local governments operating in urban contexts (Yuliantini and Suswanta 2024). Limited research explores how advocacy unfolds in environments where political, economic, and cultural forces intersect and influence community welfare outcomes (Annahar et al. 2023). Many studies maintain a narrow focus on a single actor, either NGOs or government, while neglecting to examine the negotiation processes, power asymmetries, and inter-sectoral coordination that define advocacy at the community level. Thus, deeper empirical inquiry into the mechanisms, interactions, and outcomes of collaborative advocacy remains necessary to expand current theoretical discussions in social welfare studies and policy implementation research (Wardani and Dewi 2022).

The novelty of this study lies in developing and examining a collaborative advocacy model that integrates complementary roles among social workers, NGOs, and local governments in addressing inequality in low-income urban communities. This model goes beyond conventional advocacy frameworks by emphasizing coordinated strategies, negotiated role-sharing, and adaptive decision-making between actors as they collectively seek to advance community welfare. Through a comprehensive case study design, the research demonstrates how advocacy can expand access to essential public services—including healthcare, education, social assistance, and environmental infrastructure—when implemented through structured collaborative practices. The study contributes to theoretical advancements by offering an empirically grounded explanation of how collaborative mechanisms shape advocacy performance within marginalized urban contexts (Cano et al. 2025).

To investigate these issues, the research formulates several guiding questions. First, how do advocacy dynamics unfold in efforts to confront social inequality within low-income urban communities? Second, in what ways do social workers, NGOs, and local government actors interact, negotiate roles, and coordinate actions within collaborative advocacy processes? Third, to what extent does the collaborative advocacy model contribute to improving access to basic services in disadvantaged communities? Additionally, the study explores enabling conditions and barriers that influence advocacy effectiveness, and identifies adaptive strategies that enhance the sustainability of advocacy interventions in urban settings (Kumar and Yadav 2023).

The objectives of this study are threefold. First, it seeks to analyze how social advocacy functions in advancing efforts to mitigate social inequality within low-income communities. Second, it aims to identify mechanisms of collaboration among key actors, social workers, NGOs, and government institutions, in advocacy planning and implementation (Dikrurahman 2025). Third, it seeks to assess the effectiveness of collaborative advocacy in expanding community access to essential services, while offering recommendations for strengthening institutional support for cross-sector advocacy initiatives (Bennett 2023).

Theoretical contributions of this research include advancing an integrative conceptualization of collaborative social advocacy grounded in welfare-oriented approaches responsive to the needs of marginalized communities (Hilton 2025). Academically, the study enriches the advocacy literature by emphasizing empirically derived insights situated within specific urban contexts. Practically, findings offer evidence-based guidance for practitioners and policymakers in designing more inclusive and responsive advocacy programs that strengthen community participation and improve public service access for urban poor populations (Abdullah et al. 2025). Furthermore, insights from this study have potential implications for capacity-building frameworks in governmental and civil society organizations, particularly regarding inter-sectoral coordination and social worker professional development.

The study acknowledges certain limitations. The contextual scope of the case analyzed may require caution in generalizing results to communities with different socio-political conditions or institutional arrangements (AL 2025). The case study approach also limits comparative analysis of advocacy variations across regions. Nevertheless, these limitations offer opportunities for future research. Subsequent studies could expand geographic coverage, employ comparative multi-site designs, or explore how digital technologies can be integrated into advocacy strategies to enhance community mobilization, transparency, and collective action in low-income populations (AL 2025).

Through a comprehensive examination of collaborative advocacy processes, this research suggests that well-structured advocacy grounded in partnerships across sectors can help expand access to essential services while strengthening community agency in influencing public decision-making processes (M and Huseini 2024). By presenting a collaborative advocacy model that integrates welfare-oriented dimensions of coordination and empowerment, this study contributes to ongoing efforts to institutionalize social advocacy across governmental and community systems and to promote equitable access to welfare services for all members of society.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study employed a qualitative approach supported by a comprehensive case study design. The qualitative paradigm was selected to enable an in-depth exploration of how social advocacy operates in urban low-income communities, including how actors interpret, respond to, and negotiate forms of social injustice (Supratiknya 2015). A qualitative approach allows the researcher to capture the meanings embedded in social processes, decisions, and interactions dimensions that cannot be adequately revealed through quantitative measurement.

The case study design was chosen because social inequality does not emerge in isolation. Rather, it is socially embedded in structural, cultural, and institutional contexts. Advancing a case study enables a holistic analysis of community advocacy initiatives and policy responses in a real-life setting (Jong 2022). This design provides a pathway to examine multiple perspectives simultaneously, reveal the interests and power dynamics among stakeholders, and describe the evolving relationships supporting collaborative advocacy. In addition, it allows the researcher to trace the causal mechanisms linking advocacy activities with improved access to basic services.

The research was conducted in Kelurahan Pahandut Seberang, Kecamatan Pahandut, Kota Palangka Raya, and Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. The area represents a dense residential settlement characterized by high levels of urban poverty (Mensah 2025). The site provides typical conditions faced by low-income communities in Indonesian cities: overcrowded housing, limited access to clean water, insufficient sanitation infrastructure, low educational attainment, and uneven access to health care and social support.

The location was strategically chosen for three reasons. First, the neighborhood has a long-standing history of social inequality manifested in disparities in service distribution, bureaucratic delays, fragmented welfare coordination, and frequent exclusion of vulnerable households from publicly funded assistance. Second, Pahandut Seberang has received targeted interventions from NGOs, community workers, and regional government social agencies during the past five years. These interventions involve advocacy training, facilitation of citizen forums, and participatory monitoring of welfare policies. Third, the community demonstrates internal diversity ranging from informal sector

workers to migrant families allowing for a multi-layered examination of advocacy initiatives. Through these characteristics, the research site provides a representative context for examining how advocacy strategies are enacted to reduce inequality, and how different actors form alliances, share resources, negotiate interests, and respond to constraints in service distribution (Hutahaean and Pasaribu 2022).

### Participants and Sampling Procedures

Participants were selected using purposive sampling based on criteria of involvement, experience, institutional role, and exposure to advocacy processes. Rather than focusing on numerical representation, the sampling strategy emphasized depth and relevance of experience to ensure data credibility. A total of 12 key informants were involved, representing diverse stakeholders engaged in advocacy activities and decision-making.

These informants include social workers, NGO activists, local government representatives, community facilitators, and urban poor residents directly affected by advocacy interventions. The rationale for this selection was to gather multiple voices in the advocacy chain, thereby constructing a comprehensive picture of how ideas circulate, decisions are negotiated, and power relationships unfold. Each informant had been involved with advocacy or community empowerment activities for at least two years. This duration of involvement ensured that participants possessed adequate experience to reflect on historical processes, institutional dynamics, and observed policy changes.

**Table 1. Profile of Key Informants**

No.	Actor Category	Institutional Role	Duration of Involvement
1	Social worker	Community assistance and case handling	3–5 years
2	NGO activist	Advocacy coordinator and organizer	2–4 years
3	Government official	Social welfare policy implementation	3–6 years
4–9	Local community members	Beneficiaries of advocacy programs	2–5 years
10–12	Community facilitators	Mediation and participatory planning	2–3 years

Source: Compiled by the author based on field research, 2026

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the key informants involved in this study. The table includes five categories of actors who play strategic roles in social advocacy within low-income urban communities. Social workers, NGO activists, and government officials represent institutional stakeholders responsible for designing, coordinating, and implementing advocacy-related interventions. Local community members serve as primary beneficiaries whose lived experiences provide insight into the effectiveness of advocacy actions and access to social welfare programs. Community facilitators act as intermediaries, supporting participatory planning and mediating interactions among stakeholders. The length of involvement, ranging from two to six years, indicates that informants possess sustained engagement and experiential knowledge relevant to the advocacy processes under investigation.

### Data Collection Techniques

Three primary data sources were employed in this study, namely in-depth interviews, participant observation, and documentation analysis, as a strategy to strengthen credibility through triangulation. Semi-structured interviews were selected to offer flexibility and facilitate the emergence of unanticipated issues relevant to social advocacy. Each interview lasted between 60 and 120 minutes and was conducted face-to-face in locations selected by the participants to ensure comfort, privacy, and openness. Questions explored advocacy initiatives, inter-stakeholder collaboration, access to public services, barriers in welfare distribution, and perceived transformations resulting from advocacy interventions, with probing administered to elicit reflective and detailed responses. Participant

observation was conducted during community meetings, informal group discussions, welfare distribution events, and coordination sessions involving social workers, NGOs, and government officials. This approach enabled the researcher to document interaction patterns, leadership and power dynamics, and decision-making processes. Comprehensive field notes captured implicit norms, communication styles, and relational structures that influenced advocacy practices. The documentation process involved reviewing reports, publications, policy documents, official memos, meeting minutes, and photographs, providing contextual and historical insight into advocacy trajectories, institutional commitments, and accountability mechanisms within the study setting.

### **Data Analysis Procedures**

Data analysis followed an iterative thematic analysis approach combining inductive coding and deductive reasoning based on theoretical constructs related to social justice, empowerment, and collaborative governance. The analysis proceeded in several phases.

First, audio recordings from interviews were transcribed verbatim. Second, open coding was undertaken manually to identify initial concepts emerging from the data. Codes were then categorized into themes based on similarity, frequency, and relevance. Themes such as “power relations,” “barriers to welfare access,” “collaborative advocacy practices,” “institutional constraints,” and “community empowerment outcomes” were refined through constant comparison. Subsequently, relationships between themes were mapped to generate analytical categories. The researcher compared field findings with theoretical constructs regarding advocacy strategies, welfare policy delivery, and community participation. This iterative movement between empirical data and conceptual interpretation ensured analytical rigor and minimized researcher bias.

Ensuring trustworthiness is a central concern in qualitative research, particularly when investigating socially embedded processes such as advocacy within marginalized communities. To enhance the validity and reliability of data in this study, several complementary strategies were implemented. First, triangulation of sources was conducted by comparing narratives shared by government officials, social workers, NGO activists, and local residents to identify convergent themes and detect inconsistencies. Second, triangulation of methods was applied by systematically comparing insights obtained from interview transcripts, field observations, and relevant policy documents. Member checking was also employed, whereby informants reviewed preliminary interpretations to verify their accuracy and prevent misrepresentation. In addition, the researcher maintained reflexive memos as analytical notes to record assumptions, positionality, and emerging insights, thereby ensuring transparency throughout the analytical process. Prolonged engagement in the field was undertaken to build rapport with participants and develop a deeper contextual understanding of social advocacy dynamics and structural challenges faced by low-income communities. Collectively, these strategies mitigated potential bias and strengthened the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the research findings.

Ethical rigor was ensured throughout the research process by adhering to established standards of qualitative inquiry. Informed consent was obtained prior to each interview and observation activity, with participants receiving clear explanations regarding research objectives, procedures, and potential risks. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were reminded that they retained the right to decline or withdraw at any stage without negative repercussions. To safeguard confidentiality, all personal identifiers, institutional affiliations, and sensitive case descriptions were anonymized in both field notes and research reports. Digital and physical data were securely stored in password-protected files and locked facilities, accessible only to the researcher. The use of collected information was strictly limited to academic purposes, ensuring that participants’ dignity, privacy, and autonomy were fully respected.

The chosen methodological framework provides a comprehensive basis for examining how social advocacy operates to mitigate inequality in low-income communities. The integration of in-depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis facilitates methodological triangulation, enhancing analytical robustness. This combination allows researchers to compare articulated experiences with observable practices and institutional records, thereby uncovering the intersection

between community struggles and policy implementation. The qualitative case study approach further enables the identification of structural constraints such as bureaucratic barriers and unequal power relations that shape advocacy outcomes. Ultimately, this methodological design offers a substantive empirical foundation for understanding how collaborative advocacy efforts strengthen community agency and influence governmental responses in improving access to social welfare services.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The empirical investigation conducted in Sinar Jaya revealed that social inequality persists due to entrenched institutional arrangements shaping access to public services. Observations and interviews showed that residents experienced disproportionate difficulties accessing basic administrative rights such as birth registration, health insurance enrollment, and social welfare programs. These processes required multiple supporting documents, some of which were inaccessible due to informal housing arrangements and undocumented migration histories. The bureaucratic procedures embedded within administrative systems were characterized by complicated steps that required literacy, procedural understanding, and familiarity with government pathways. Residents lacking these competencies frequently failed to complete applications or abandoned them midway due to unclear requirements and repeated delays. Administrative offices reportedly provided limited procedural guidance, and communication channels were fragmented, producing information asymmetry between authorities and impoverished households. This strengthened a cycle in which only individuals with adequate administrative literacy, social capital, or institutional networks benefited consistently from public policies.

These access barriers suggest that inequality is not solely a product of economic deprivation, but rather a systemic reproduction of disadvantage rooted in formal rules and practices. The evidence aligns with Rawls' theory that institutions should be structured to benefit the least advantaged. In Sinar Jaya, bureaucratic rules inadvertently prioritized formal competence over universal administrative rights, thereby marginalizing those with lower educational backgrounds. When authorities prioritize rigid compliance without considering social realities of poverty, procedural justice becomes compromised. Field findings thus demonstrate that structural injustice manifests through neutral administrative rules that yield unequal consequences for different populations.

Residents' narratives described how the absence of transparent information limited their ability to plan administrative processes. Confusion about eligibility criteria, conflicting guidance regarding required documents, and inconsistent enforcement across government offices created persistent uncertainty. For example, some residents were informed that welfare registration required proof of permanent residence, while others gained approval using temporary address letters. Such discretionary interpretation reinforced perceptions of arbitrariness and unequal treatment. Lack of procedural transparency also discouraged community engagement in policy arenas, reinforcing their marginal position within administrative hierarchies. These empirical patterns illustrate the complex interplay between governance structures and socioeconomic vulnerability, whereby institutional gatekeeping amplifies inequality despite formal guarantees of equal access.

As a result, advocacy efforts emerged as alternative mechanisms to reduce administrative burdens. Advocacy actors helped citizens obtain procedural clarity, interpret documentation requirements, and complete application forms. They communicated community grievances to authorities and mediated administrative disputes. The findings demonstrate that advocacy functions as a corrective mechanism to structural injustice by reshaping institutional responsiveness. Yet the persistence of bureaucratic obstacles indicates that advocacy alone cannot eliminate inequality without institutional change. Thus, structural reform remains essential to sustaining equitable access to public services.

### **Weak Social Capital, Fragmented Collective Action, and Limited Network Bridging**

The second major finding concerns the role of social capital in shaping residents' capacity to navigate public administration. The social networks in Sinar Jaya were characterized by weak bridging ties between community members and external actors, including government agencies and service providers. Residents reported limited trust in public officers, citing historical neglect, prior experiences

of rejected applications, and perceptions that service delivery favored politically connected groups. This distrust reduced motivation to engage with formal administrative systems and discouraged participation in public meetings or policy consultations. The absence of trust also impeded collective organization, as residents rarely mobilized to demand accountability or advocate for structural reform.

Fragmentation within the community further weakened collective action potential. The population of Sinar Jaya is relatively transient, influenced by fluctuating employment opportunities and informal housing arrangements. Limited access to shared public spaces reduced opportunities for communal interactions, diminishing the development of horizontal social cohesion. As Putnam theorizes, low bonding and bridging social capital undermines the ability to address common concerns and negotiate with authorities. Interviews with community leaders confirmed that residents seldom coordinated advocacy efforts collectively, instead approaching administrative processes individually. This individualized strategy exacerbated vulnerability, as isolated applicants lacked bargaining power to influence policy outcomes.

Advocacy actors attempted to compensate for these weaknesses by creating communication platforms, organizing administrative support sessions, and facilitating dialogue among stakeholders. Observations during advocacy meetings indicated that these forums gradually increased interaction between residents and officials, enhanced information flow, and initiated early trust rebuilding. However, trust development remained fragile and conditional upon observable improvements in service responsiveness. When applications stalled or procedural barriers persisted, distrust resurfaced, illustrating the delicate nature of social relationships in contexts of institutional marginalization.

Advocacy initiatives conducted without community participation frequently failed due to lack of legitimacy and resistance from administrative offices. Conversely, collaborative efforts involving NGOs, social workers, and community volunteers generated stronger outcomes, demonstrating the centrality of multi-actor engagement. These findings suggest that building social capital is fundamental to creating enabling conditions for collaborative advocacy. Effective advocacy requires not only technical procedural assistance but also trust-building practices and network development to foster sustained institutional cooperation. In this context, advocacy becomes a vehicle for strengthening social ties, mobilizing community participation, and enhancing collective agency, thereby advancing equitable governance.

### **Limited Empowerment and Insufficient Administrative Literacy among Residents**

The third major empirical theme concerns the limited empowerment of residents, particularly regarding administrative literacy, confidence, and participatory engagement. Interview data indicate that residents generally lacked knowledge about government procedures, eligibility criteria, complaint mechanisms, or pathways for appealing rejected applications. Many participants expressed fear or reluctance to communicate with officials due to perceived power asymmetries and feelings of incompetence. These findings confirm Rappaport's conceptualization of empowerment as a process requiring capacity development and institutional opportunity structures. Without adequate skills and access to participatory channels, residents remain dependent on intermediaries to advocate for their welfare rights.

Advocacy actors implemented capacity-building activities to enhance administrative literacy. These included procedural explanations, mentoring sessions, and accompaniment during office visits. Observations suggest that such interventions gradually increased confidence, enabling residents to articulate needs more assertively and follow up on application status without external assistance. Nevertheless, capacity building remained uneven, with progress concentrated among individuals regularly engaged with advocacy programs. The broader community continued to experience empowerment deficits, highlighting the need for institutionalized, long-term empowerment initiatives rather than project-based interventions.

Residents perceived advocacy not only as technical assistance but also as psychological support that reduced feelings of powerlessness. Advocacy actors provided encouragement and reassurance, legitimizing residents' claims to welfare rights. Participants emphasized that advocacy presence

increased their sense of agency and improved their willingness to participate in administrative processes. Thus, empowerment emerged as a multidimensional outcome encompassing cognitive, emotional, and procedural domains. However, sustained empowerment requires institutional reform to ensure that participatory spaces remain accessible and responsive to marginalized groups.

### Empirical Summary of Key Findings

The empirical results demonstrate that structural barriers, weak social capital, and empowerment deficits collectively reproduce inequality in access to basic services. These dimensions interact dynamically: administrative burdens reinforce disengagement; distrust undermines collaboration; and limited capacity restricts community participation. Advocacy functions to mitigate these constraints through information transfer, mediation, and capacity building. The findings emphasize that advocacy produces more effective outcomes when roles among NGOs, social workers, and government actors are coordinated. Collaborative advocacy reshapes governance relationships and enhances institutional responsiveness, thereby reducing inequality through improved communication, transparency, and procedural justice.

**Table 1. Underlying Challenges, and Advocacy Implications**

<b>Empirical Dimension</b>	<b>Core Challenges Identified Through Field Data</b>	<b>Implications for Advocacy Practice</b>
Access to Services	Structural barriers, documentation burdens, opaque procedures	Advocacy should facilitate administrative reform and improve procedural transparency
Social Networks	Weak bridging ties, distrust, fragmented community engagement	Advocacy must strengthen social capital and trust-building mechanisms
Empowerment	Limited administrative literacy, low institutional confidence	Advocacy requires long-term capacity-building initiatives and institutional support

Source: Compiled by the author based on field research, 2026

The table 1 summarizes the key empirical challenges identified in the field and their implications for advocacy practices. The first dimension concerns access to services, where residents experience bureaucratic barriers, complex documentation requirements, and unclear procedures. These structural obstacles suggest that advocacy efforts need to focus on reforming administrative systems and enhancing procedural transparency. The second dimension highlights weaknesses in social networks, including limited bridging ties and a lack of trust between residents and public officials. Addressing this issue requires advocacy strategies that strengthen social capital and promote inclusive engagement. The third dimension relates to empowerment deficits, particularly limited administrative literacy and low institutional confidence. These findings indicate that long-term capacity-building initiatives and institutional support are essential to ensure meaningful and sustainable advocacy outcomes.

The table summarizes the interconnected empirically grounded findings demonstrating that inequality persists through institutional, social, and cognitive mechanisms. Borrowing from Rawls, Putnam, and Rappaport, the findings illustrate that effective advocacy requires institutional reform, trust restoration, and empowerment enhancement to reduce structural inequality in underserved communities.

The discussion contextualizes the empirical findings within broader theoretical debates and contributes to academic discourse on social advocacy, social justice, community organizing, and collective action. The analysis interprets how collaborative advocacy mechanisms influence public service delivery and respond to systemic inequality affecting low-income urban residents.

The core problem examined in this study concerns uneven access to social services among marginalized populations. Prior research generally attributes service inequality to inadequate state capacity and uneven policy implementation. The findings of this study support those conclusions, but

extend them by demonstrating that inequality is exacerbated by insufficient institutional sensitivity to localized needs. Administrative burdens disproportionately disadvantage low-income communities, who often lack information, administrative competencies, and opportunities for participation. The findings reinforce Rawls' assertion that justice must prioritize equitable access to social goods for the least advantaged. The research therefore positions advocacy as a redistributive mechanism to correct institutional asymmetry.

Within the context of community organizing theory, the findings reveal that effective community mobilization requires alignment between informal community networks and formal governance structures. While existing scholarship highlights community leadership and social solidarity as drivers of mobilization, this study underscores the importance of intermediary actors capable of bridging the divide between citizen groups and government institutions. The collaborative advocacy model thus expands theoretical understanding by demonstrating that social workers and NGOs play complementary roles central to mobilization success. These findings contribute to scholarship by explaining that the presence of institutional allies increases the credibility and policy influence of citizen demands.

The empowerment perspective further clarifies how collaborative advocacy fosters structural change. Previous research shows that empowerment involves psychological, social, and organizational dimensions that collectively strengthen community control over decisions affecting their lives. The present study provides empirical evidence that community participation increases when advocacy interventions integrate capacity building, administrative literacy education, and structured policy dialogue. These findings illuminate that empowerment is not merely an individual-level intervention, but rather a systemic process requiring institutional recognition and policy responsiveness. Collaborative advocacy strengthens empowerment by embedding community voice in policy deliberation.

Collective action theory explains why advocacy efforts led by isolated actors often fail in urban poverty contexts. Fragmented interests, weak social cohesion, and power imbalances hinder sustained collective action. The findings reveal that structural support provided by NGOs and social workers reduces organizational burdens and expands access to decision-making arenas, facilitating coordinated action. Collaborative advocacy therefore functions as a mediating mechanism between collective action and institutional reform, demonstrating that empowerment and social capital must converge to achieve policy influence.

A critical contribution of this study lies in addressing a persistent gap in the literature: the limited exploration of collaborative advocacy models in urban poverty contexts. Existing studies tend to analyze advocacy as a linear or actor-specific intervention rather than a dynamic multi-actor process. This study bridges that gap by documenting how advocacy outcomes improve when formal and informal institutions coordinate roles. This theoretical advancement offers new insights for scholars examining institutional design and policy responsiveness in the context of social inequality.

The research problem regarding the mechanisms through which social advocacy influences inequality is addressed through findings demonstrating that advocacy facilitates structural reform by strengthening negotiation capacity, promoting participatory decision-making, and improving accountability processes. The collaborative advocacy model functions through interconnected mechanisms: communication channels, institutional cooperation, capacity building, and policy modifications. This model challenges dominant assumptions that advocacy effectiveness depends solely on citizen mobilization, instead illustrating the importance of vertical alignment between state and non-state actors.

The research objectives to analyze the role of advocacy, examine collaborative mechanisms, and evaluate model effectiveness are met through integration of empirical results and theoretical interpretations. The discussion demonstrates that advocacy effectiveness cannot be understood independent of institutional context and power dynamics. The collaborative model proposed advances the argument that advocacy constitutes an instrument of structural transformation when accompanied

by capacity enhancement and institutional reform. This interpretation advances current discourse by articulating a relational understanding of advocacy processes.

The theoretical contributions extend into three domains. First, the study offers an applied elaboration of Rawls' principles by illustrating how advocacy redistributes institutional access for marginalized residents. Second, by confirming Putnam's emphasis on bridging social capital, the findings advance scholarship on social networks and public policy by demonstrating operational pathways through which networks influence policy access. Third, by grounding empowerment theory in the context of bureaucratic institutions, the study deepens understanding of how institutional design affects empowerment outcomes.

From a practical standpoint, the study identifies actionable strategies to strengthen advocacy effectiveness, including: multi-stakeholder collaboration frameworks; formalized communication protocols between institutions; and long-term community empowerment programs to improve administrative literacy. The findings demonstrate that advocacy's success depends not only on mobilizing community voice but also on ensuring institutional receptivity. The study therefore argues that advocacy must be positioned within broader governance reform strategies to achieve sustainable inequality reduction.

The implementation gap identified in findings highlights misalignment between policy design and community needs. While existing policies provide formal access to services, procedural complexity and fragmented coordination reduce accessibility for low-income populations. The study demonstrates that collaborative advocacy plays a corrective role by realigning policy implementation with lived realities of marginalized communities. This contributes to governance scholarship by clarifying that advocacy forms part of a system of accountability essential to equitable public service delivery.

The discussion also reflects on sustainability of advocacy impacts. Without institutional support, advocacy outcomes risk fragmentation and eventual decline. Therefore, the study recommends institutionalizing advocacy mechanisms, mainstreaming participatory processes into public service systems, expanding capacity development for social workers and NGOs, and allocating public resources for advocacy support. Strengthening institutional frameworks ensures advocacy transitions from episodic intervention to systemic governance practice.

The broader significance of the findings lies in demonstrating that advocacy offers a strategic mechanism for reducing social inequality through participatory governance. The study advances the argument that collaborative advocacy not only improves service access but also transforms institutional relationships, enabling more inclusive governance systems. These results contribute to scholarly debates on social justice by illustrating how advocacy operationalizes rights claims within structural frameworks. Moreover, the collaborative advocacy model can be adapted for policy contexts beyond Sinar Jaya, offering a scalable framework for social welfare systems facing similar structural inequalities.

In sum, this discussion affirms that addressing social inequality in low-income urban communities requires advocacy strategies that integrate community empowerment, institutional coordination, and governance reform. The research provides new theoretical and practical insights demonstrating that advocacy becomes a transformative force when operationalized as a multi-actor, collaborative intervention embedded within justice and empowerment frameworks. The study advances a conceptual foundation for strengthening advocacy systems in future policy development, contributing meaningfully to academic discourse and offering practical guidance for policy actors committed to building equitable social systems.

## **CONCLUSION**

The findings of this research confirm that social advocacy plays a decisive role in mitigating multidimensional inequalities experienced by low-income groups in urban poverty settings. These communities face entrenched structural disadvantages manifested through limited access to basic services, weak social protection guarantees, and restricted involvement in public decision-making. The study shows that inequality is not rooted solely in economic deprivation; rather, it is perpetuated through

institutional barriers that hinder marginalized residents from defending and advancing their social rights. Within this context, social advocacy emerges as a critical mechanism that connects community needs with governmental responses, while simultaneously strengthening citizens' bargaining positions within political and social systems that influence their welfare.

The empirical evidence indicates that collaborative advocacy models bringing together social workers, non-governmental organizations, and local authorities enhance efforts to address social injustice more effectively than fragmented approaches. The involvement of multiple actors reduces bureaucratic obstacles that typically constrain community access to public services, and at the same time expands opportunities for structured dialogue and negotiation. Advocacy practices in the form of accompaniment, facilitation of deliberative spaces, and capacity building for residents demonstrate measurable impacts on governmental responsiveness, particularly in recognizing and responding to the needs of impoverished households. These results affirm that synergistic relationships between formal and informal actors constitute an essential pillar for building inclusive social governance.

Furthermore, the study reveals that advocacy produces meaningful change when it fosters critical awareness among residents, supports sustained community organizing, and encourages government willingness to institutionalize participation. Collective action initiated within communities, enabled by advocacy interventions, generates social and political pressure that pushes governments to reform service delivery patterns. This process reinforces the relevance of the theoretical frameworks grounding this research social justice theory, community organization theory, and collective action theory. From a social justice perspective, advocacy broadens opportunities for disadvantaged residents to obtain fairer and more proportionate services. From a community organization lens, advocacy demonstrates how empowerment and solidarity serve as foundational drivers of social transformation. Meanwhile, the collective action perspective highlights the role of advocacy in mobilizing marginalized voices to participate in the policy arena.

The study contributes a conceptual advancement by addressing a gap in previous scholarship, which insufficiently examined how collaborative advocacy models operate in practice within the context of urban social inequality. Whereas prior research tended to focus on either community-led initiatives or governmental interventions in isolation, this study demonstrates that advocacy success depends on the integration of roles across actors. The findings introduce new insights into how interlinking community, civil society, and governmental capacities enhances the potential for responsive policy change.

Overall, the research concludes that social advocacy does not merely serve as a form of resistance or protest; it constitutes a strategic instrument for institutional transformation. Advocacy directly broadens access to fundamental services including health, education, social assistance, and environmental management while strengthening bureaucratic transparency, expanding formal dialogue channels, and enabling communities to organize autonomously. These improvements reveal that advocacy functions both at the micro level, by empowering individuals and communities, and at the structural level, by reshaping policy dynamics and governance arrangements.

Sustained advocacy, however, requires institutional reinforcement. Without long-term support mechanisms, advocacy initiatives risk becoming temporary and losing momentum. Therefore, strengthening the institutional foundation of advocacy through collaboration frameworks, capacity development, and financial support is essential for maintaining durable change. Ultimately, this research establishes that social advocacy is a relevant and effective strategy to reduce social inequality in low-income urban contexts. The collaborative advocacy model narrows the gap between community needs and governmental policy responses, advancing more equitable and inclusive welfare outcomes. The study thus provides meaningful theoretical, practical, and empirical contributions to ongoing discourse on social advocacy and social policy reform.

Recommendations are proposed to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of social advocacy in urban poverty contexts. While advocacy has demonstrated significant contributions in linking residents' aspirations to governmental policies, its durability depends on stronger institutional support

and systemic integration. The recommendations below target governments, practitioners, researchers, and community stakeholders.

First, local governments should institutionalize formal multi-stakeholder collaboration mechanisms that consistently engage social workers, civil society organizations, and community representatives in policy formulation and implementation processes. Establishing structured platforms for regular consultation both at the planning and evaluation stages ensures that community needs and priorities are not merely reactive inputs but are embedded from the outset of policy cycle design. This approach will expand public participation beyond symbolic involvement and foster shared responsibility in addressing inequality.

Second, professional development for social workers must be prioritized, recognizing their pivotal role as facilitators, advocates, and mediators between communities and public institutions. Findings show that social workers require advanced competences in advocacy communication, policy analysis, and grassroots organizing. Universities and local governments should collaborate in developing pragmatic training modules tailored to frontline realities, ensuring social workers are equipped to navigate structural barriers and empower marginalized residents effectively.

Third, civil society organizations must be empowered as strategic partners in implementing advocacy interventions. Their proximity to communities enables them to identify invisible forms of injustice and articulate socio-political claims that may not be recognized by formal structures. Governments should institutionalize transparent resource allocation and periodic dialogue forums to preserve the independence and legitimacy of NGOs. Formalized partnerships through memoranda of understanding will strengthen collaborative governance frameworks that support sustained policy influence.

Fourth, service delivery systems must be streamlined to reduce bureaucratic burdens, which remain major obstacles for low-income residents seeking access to services. Government agencies should develop integrated service systems that consolidate information, assistance, and complaint mechanisms into accessible channels. Social advocacy can serve as a feedback loop, communicating real-time community challenges and supporting iterative reforms. Simpler procedures and accessible information will significantly reduce inequitable barriers to basic services.

Fifth, community-level organizing must be strengthened to support long-term sustainability of advocacy efforts. The study finds that advocacy outcomes are maximized when grassroots organizations possess strong internal structures for managing collective aspirations. Capacity-building programs should therefore support the formation and strengthening of neighborhood forums, advocacy committees, or other community-based groups. This will enable communities to maintain advocacy efforts even in the absence of constant external facilitation.

Sixth, future academic inquiry should expand examination of collaborative advocacy models in varied socioeconomic environments to assess generalizability and context sensitivity. Researchers could explore how digital platforms can be leveraged to broaden civic participation and improve responsiveness in social advocacy. Further study into the power dynamics among stakeholders involved in advocacy is also essential, as these negotiations influence the trajectory and impact of advocacy processes.

Finally, at the national level, advocacy must be integrated into broader policy frameworks addressing social inequality. A national strategy for social advocacy, supported by political commitment and regulatory reinforcement, would provide legitimacy and continuity for advocacy initiatives. Such institutionalization would reduce dependence on ad-hoc interventions, helping embed advocacy into sustainable systems of inclusive governance.

Collectively, these recommendations emphasize that strengthening institutional environments, enhancing professional capacity, empowering communities, and advancing collaborative governance will substantially reinforce the transformative potential of social advocacy in confronting social inequalities in low-income urban contexts.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, Sara, Serena Hong, Michelle Vinod, Hasha Siddiqui, Cília Mejía-Lancheros, Uzma Irfan, Angela Carter, Ian Spencer Zenlea, and Dianne Fierheller. 2025. "A Collaborative Response to Addressing Family Violence with Racialized and Diverse Communities During Pandemic Recovery in Peel Region." *Social Sciences* 14(6):347. doi: 10.3390/socsci14060347.
- Ahmed, Md Wasim, and Md Joshim Uddin. 2025. "Environmental Justice and the Role of Legal Advocacy in Addressing Climate Change." *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies* 7(4):45–64. doi: 10.32996/jhsss.2025.7.4.6.
- Aini, Haniyah Shofiyatul. 2024. "Phenomenology Studies in Public Policy Analysis." *Journal of Governance and Administrative Reform* 5(2):195–208. doi: 10.20473/jgar.v5i2.53729.
- Ajmani, Leah, Mo Houtti, Jasmine C. Foriest, Michael Ann Devito, Nicholas Vincent, and Isaac Johnson. 2023. "Epistemic Injustice in Online Communities: Unpacking the Values of Knowledge Creation and Curation within CSCW Applications." *Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* 527–31. doi: 10.1145/3584931.3611280.
- AL, McCart. 2025. "The Role of Social Bonds in Facilitating Shared Investments and Resource Allocation: Addressing the 'Wrong Pocket Problem' in Public Health and Healthcare." *Journal of Quality in Health Care & Economics* 8(2):1–12. doi: 10.23880/jqhe-16000437.
- Annahar, Nasrun, Ida Widianingsih, Entang Adhy Muhtar, and Caroline Paskarina. 2023. "The Road to Inclusive Decentralized Village Governance in Indonesia." *Sustainability (Switzerland)* 15(11). doi: 10.3390/su15118616.
- Anon. 2024a. "Bicultural Identity." *The Sage Encyclopedia of Multicultural Counseling, Social Justice, and Advocacy*. doi: 10.4135/9781071808023.n55.
- Anon. 2024b. "High-Context and Low-Context Cultures, Communication In." *The Sage Encyclopedia of Multicultural Counseling, Social Justice, and Advocacy*. doi: 10.4135/9781071808023.n254.
- Ashok, Mahima. 2024. "Breaking the Silence: Fighting Injustice with Anti-Marginalization Advocacy." *Journal of Social Science and Humanities* 6(10):166–69. doi: 10.53469/jssh.2024.6(10).30.
- Bennett, Susan. 2023. "Re-Thinking 'Global Shakespeare' for Social Justice." *Global Shakespeare and Social Injustice* 19–35. doi: 10.5040/9781350335127.0007.
- Cano, Andrea, Mohy Uddin, Fernanda Caceres, José Rodriguez, and Shabbir Syed-Abdul. 2025. "Engaging with Patients with Diabetes: The Role of Social Media in Low-Income Healthcare Organisations." *BMJ Health & Care Informatics* 32(1). doi: 10.1136/bmjhci-2024-101193.
- Clore, Lauren, Rajeev Agrawal, and Janine Rethy. 2023. "Social Connectedness as a Social Determinant of Health in Low Income Families with Young Children." *Social Determinants and Vulnerable Populations* 4261. doi: 10.1370/afm.21.s1.4261.
- Dikrurahman, Diki. 2025. "The Role of Courts in Addressing Social Inequality." *Journal of Law and Social Politics* 3(1):27–36. doi: 10.46799/jlsp.v3i1.57.
- Drimie, Scott. 2025. "The Essential Role of Interdisciplinary Approaches in Addressing Hunger and Social Justice: The 2024 International Social Justice Conference and Summit in Cape Town." *South African Journal of Science* 121(3). doi: 10.17159/sajs.2025/20624.
- Guarcello, Emanuela. 2024. "The Reflective Action Of The Project STEREO: Sport, School And Social Injustice." *AERA* 2024. doi: 10.3102/ip.24.2107074.
- Hilton, Jeremy. 2025. "Building a Governance Reference Model for a Specific Enterprise: Addressing Social Challenges Through Structured Solution." doi: 10.20944/preprints202508.1860.v1.
- Holt, Kimberly Long. 2025. "The Psychological Toll of Environmental Injustice in Marginalized Communities." *Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Science* 2(2):186–93. doi: 10.69739/jahss.v2i2.722.
- Hutahaean, Marlan, and Johnson Pasaribu. 2022. "Bureaucratic Reform and Changes in Public Service

- Paradigm Post-Decentralization in Indonesia: 2001-2010.” *KnE Social Sciences*. doi: 10.18502/kss.v7i5.10595.
- Idrees, Syed Hassan, Adnan Khan, Muhammad Zia Iqbal, Aroobah Jawwad, Muhammad Israr, Dua Imran, and Muhammad Damil Farid. 2025. “Awareness And Screening Barriers For Ocular Tumors Among High-Risk Adults In Low-Income Urban Communities.” *Insights-Journal of Life and Social Sciences* 3(5):66–72. doi: 10.71000/5gqy2104.
- Jong, M. 2022. “Improving Field Boundary Delineation in ResUNets via Adversarial Deep Learning.” *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 112. doi: 10.1016/j.jag.2022.102877.
- Kumar, Sarvesh, and Sunil Kumar Yadav. 2023. “The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Addressing Global Social Challenges.” *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development* 11(6). doi: 10.55908/sdgs.v11i6.1190.
- Leung, Patrick, Monit Cheung, and Carol A. Leung. 2024. “Service Access to Depression Treatment.” *Addressing Anti-Asian Racism with Social Work Advocacy and Action* 270–95. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780197672242.003.0015.
- Looby, Eugenie Joan, Zaccheus James Ahonle, Tinmuk Li, Lindsey Donald, Kimberly Tillman Gray, Shayna Carter, and Abdullah Almutairi. 2023. “Underserved Disability Populations in Rural Communities.” *Advances in Psychology, Mental Health, and Behavioral Studies* 24–56. doi: 10.4018/978-1-6684-6155-6.ch002.
- M, Sura Fabio, and Martani Huseini. 2024. “An Analysis of The Role of Law In The Formation of Social Identity In Urban Communities.” *Asian Journal of Social and Humanities* 2(10):2277–86. doi: 10.59888/ajosh.v2i10.384.
- Meena, G., Shrinwantu Raha, P. Selvakumar, Mohit, Pamarthi Satyanarayana, and Chirayu Vats. 2025. “The Role of AI in Combatting Extremism and Radicalization on Social Media.” *Advances in Social Networking and Online Communities* 63–90. doi: 10.4018/979-8-3693-9904-0.ch004.
- Mensah, Kwame. 2025. “Research on Digital Governance and Public Service Process Optimization from the Perspective of Public Value Creation.” *Public Management and Service* 1(1):26–31. doi: 10.64229/eth8f224.
- Mitchell, Tina. 2024. “Dismantling Injustice Through Advocacy: Understanding Preservice Teachers’ Concept of Advocacy for Diverse Youth.” *Proceedings of the 2024 AERA Annual Meeting*. doi: 10.3102/2110159.
- Mzinyane, Bongane, Santham Ajodhia, Sandile N. Gumbi, Gift Khumalo, Sethenjwa B. Nduli, Zwelisha Mfishi, Bokang Lipholo, and Nosipho Funeka. 2024. “An Autoethnography of Disaster Response Work with Low-Income Communities in KZN: Implications for Afrocentric Social Work.” *Journal of Social Development in Africa* 39(2):42–67. doi: 10.4314/jsda.v39i2.4.
- Parmar, Hemlata, and Utsav Krishan Murari. 2025. “Human-AI Synergy in Ethical Content Moderation.” *Advances in Social Networking and Online Communities* 191–212. doi: 10.4018/979-8-3693-9904-0.ch009.
- Supratiknya, A. 2015. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif & Kualitatif Dalam Psikologi*. Vol. 11. books.google.com.
- Sylvestre, Desiree. 2025. “Developing a Youth Mental Well-Being Curriculum in Racialized and Low-Income Communities: Integrating Social-Emotional Learning in STEM.” *Proceedings of the 2025 AERA Annual Meeting*. doi: 10.3102/2186377.
- Varma, Anita. 2022. “Moral Solidarity as a News Value: Rendering Marginalized Communities and Enduring Social Injustice Newsworthy.” *Journalism* 24(9):1880–98. doi: 10.1177/14648849221094669.
- Wardani, Suhgrowardi Anggun, and Santi Rahma Dewi. 2022. “The Influence of the Implementation of Accounting Information Systems, Performance-Based Budgeting Applications, and

Performance Reporting Systems on the Performance Accountability of Sidoarjo Regency Government Agencies.” *Indonesian Journal of Public Policy Review* 19. doi: 10.21070/ijppr.v19i0.1269.

Wilson, Traci, and Suzanne Kunkel. 2022. “BEFORE IT WAS COOL: THE AGING NETWORK’S ROLE IN ADDRESSING SOCIAL NEEDS AND REDUCING DISPARITIES.” *Innovation in Aging* 6:73. doi: 10.1093/geroni/igac059.293.

Yasmeen, Farzana khan, Saima Ishfaq, Samina Ghouri, Muhammad Ali, Abdul Aziz, and Hafiz Muhammad Usman Abid. 2025. “Empowering Rural Communities Through Health Education: A Community-Based Intervention On Diarrhea Prevention In Sindh, Pakistanempowering Rural Communities Through Health Education: A Community-Based Intervention On DIARRHEA PREVENTION IN SINDH, PAKISTAN.” *Insights-Journal of Health and Rehabilitation* 3(4):33–39.

Yuliantini, Lisa Sophia, and Suswanta Suswanta. 2024. “The Effectiveness Analysis of the National Digital Literacy Movement SiBerkreasi Program in Indonesia.” *SHS Web of Conferences* 204:03004. doi: 10.1051/shsconf/202420403004