



Implications of Food Security Policy Advocacy for The Well-Being of Women Farmers Group Members in Tanjungpinang City

Yesi Perdeawati^{*1}, Armauliza Septiawan², Okparizan³

Magister Administrasi Publik,
Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji Tanjungpinang, Indonesia

*) Corresponding Author

yperdeawati@student.umrah.ac.id

Received : May 25, 2026; Accepted : August 27, 2026

DOI 10.25299/jiap.2026.28401

Abstrak

This study analyzes the mechanism of food security policy advocacy and its implications for the well-being of Women Farmers Group (KWT) members in Tanjungpinang City. The study employed a mixed-methods approach with a qualitative analytical emphasis. Data were collected through a survey of 242 members out of 613 members across 31 KWTs, interviews, observations, and document analysis. The analysis used the Policy Input–Policy Process–Policy Output–Policy Outcome framework. The findings show that KWT needs include production facilities, mentoring, program sustainability, market access, and institutional strengthening. Advocacy takes place through interest articulation, communication, forums, networking, coordination, and negotiation. Policy responses in the form of program support, facilitation, mentoring, and institutional strengthening have implications for production capacity, economic activity, food access, and social benefits. KWT vegetable production increased from 620.12 quintals in 2022 to 1,257.80 quintals in 2025. Advocacy is not positioned as the sole cause of well-being, but as an intermediary mechanism connecting community needs with policy responses.

Keywords : policy advocacy, food security, Women Farmers Groups, collaborative governance, well-being.

Introduction

Tanjungpinang City has these characteristics. Developing urban food security requires strategies that can utilize limited space while optimizing community capacity. Women Farmers Groups (Kelompok Wanita Tani/KWT) are one form of community institution that contributes to food production, home-garden utilization, learning, and economic activities. This study records 31 KWTs with 613 members. The existence of these groups constitutes social and institutional capital, but does not automatically make KWTs actors with influence in the policy process. The main issue in this study is not merely whether the government provides programs to KWTs, but how KWT needs are articulated and advocated within the policy process. Distinguishing advocacy from implementation is therefore important. The provision of seeds, fertilizer, facilities, training, and extension services constitutes program intervention. Such activities can be understood as part of advocacy only when there is an interest being pursued, an actor or target to be influenced, a strategy, interaction, and a traceable policy response.

Previous studies have discussed policy advocacy, community empowerment, urban agriculture, and food security. However, three research gaps remain. First, there is a conceptual gap, as relatively few studies clearly distinguish community advocacy from program implementation. Second, there is an actor gap, as limited research positions KWTs as policy actors that articulate interests rather than merely as program beneficiaries. Third, there is a context gap, as studies on food security advocacy in archipelagic urban settings with limited land remain limited.

This study uses the perspectives of community-based policy advocacy and collaborative governance to explain the relationship between community needs and government responses. The Policy Input–Policy Process–Policy Output–Policy Outcome analytical framework is used to trace this relationship empirically. Policy input includes needs, aspirations, actors, regulations, and resources; policy process includes articulation, communication, forums, networking, coordination, and negotiation; policy output includes support, facilitation, mentoring, and institutional strengthening; while policy outcome includes changes in production, food access, economic activity, capacity, and well-being.

The study aims to analyze the mechanism of community-based food security policy advocacy in Tanjungpinang City, identify the actors and strategies involved, analyze the resulting policy responses, and explain their implications for food security and the well-being of KWT members.

Method

The study employed a mixed-methods approach with a qualitative analytical emphasis. This approach was selected because the study included survey data from KWT members as well as interview, observation, and documentary data required to explain the advocacy mechanism. Quantitative data were used as supporting evidence, while the explanation of the advocacy process and relationships among dimensions was developed primarily through qualitative analysis.

The study was conducted in Tanjungpinang City. The population consisted of 613 members from 31 KWTs. Based on the sample calculation, 242 respondents were selected. Qualitative informants were purposively selected based on their involvement and knowledge of food security policy, including KWT leaders/members, local government

officials, extension workers or mentors, and other relevant stakeholders.

Research data were obtained from two main sources, namely informants and supporting documents. Informants were purposively selected based on their direct involvement in program implementation so that they could provide relevant, in-depth information consistent with the research focus. The documents included archives, reports, and various administrative data related to the implementation of community-based food security policy advocacy in Tanjungpinang City. The use of documents was intended to complement, verify, and strengthen data obtained from interviews and field observations. By combining primary data from informants and secondary data from documents, the study sought to produce a comprehensive, valid, and contextual analysis of food security policy advocacy and its implications for the well-being of KWT members.

Table 1. Research Informants

Position	Information Source
Legislative representative	Informan A
KWT	Informan B
NGO	Informan C
Government official	Informan D
Government official	Informan E
Public figure	Informan F

Source: Primary data.

Informants were selected using purposive sampling, namely deliberate selection of subjects based on the consideration that they possessed relevant knowledge, experience, and direct involvement in the research topic. This technique was used to obtain data that were relevant, in-depth, and aligned with the analysis of community-based food security policy advocacy.

The research instruments included an interview guide developed around three main dimensions: policy input, process, and output. An observation guide was also used to examine field conditions, interactions among implementers, and program implementation directly. Documentation served as an important instrument for verifying written information through KWT and DP3 archives, program reports, and other administrative documents. Supporting instruments included observation sheets, interview guides, document checklists, a camera, and an audio recorder.

Data collection techniques included participant observation, in which the researcher directly observed the implementation of policy advocacy in the field; in-depth interviews with key informants, leaders, and supporting actors; and documentary studies of archives and official documents related to program implementation. The combination of these techniques was intended to obtain comprehensive, valid, and in-depth data.

Data were analyzed interactively through data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification using the Policy Input–Policy Process–Policy Output–Policy Outcome framework. This framework was used to trace the relationship between KWT needs and aspirations, the advocacy process, policy responses, and food security and well-being outcomes. The credibility of findings was strengthened through source and

method triangulation, while quantitative data were used to support qualitative interpretation. The operationalization of the analysis is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Operationalization of the Analytical Framework

Dimension	Focus	Main Indicators	Data Sources
Policy Input	Initial needs and capacity	aspirations, actors, regulations, resources, mentoring	survey, interviews, documents
Policy Process	Advocacy mechanism	articulation, communication, forums, networking, coordination, negotiation	interviews, observations
Policy Output	Policy response	programs, facilitation, mentoring, institutions	interviews, documents, survey
Policy Outcome	Implications	production, food, economy, capacity, well-being	survey, production data, interviews

Source: Developed by the researcher based on the research findings and analytical framework, 2026.

Result and Discussion

Policy Input: KWT Needs and Initial Capacity

The policy input indicates that KWTs operate within a relatively available policy environment, but their capacity to access and influence policy remains suboptimal. Existing regulations and government programs provide space for food security activities, while group needs have developed around production facilities, mentoring, program sustainability, market access, and institutional strengthening.

Interviews with Informants B, C, and F indicate that KWT strengthening has not yet been supported by a local regulation specifically governing the sustainability and strengthening of the groups. Informants D and E, interviewed on 13 April 2026, explained that KWT policies remain integrated into sectoral policies, including family nutrition and inflation-control programs. This condition makes the sustainability of support highly dependent on available sectoral programs and priorities.

Mentoring capacity is also a constraint. The number of extension workers recorded in the study decreased from 14 to 3 in 2025. This reduction affected the intensity of mentoring. Interview findings indicate that mentoring, which had previously been more routine, became less frequent. In the context of advocacy, extension workers are not only technical actors but also information links between groups and government.

These findings show that the input problem is not merely a material limitation but also involves institutional and information capacity. KWTs may have clearly identified needs, but their ability to transform those needs into policy agendas is influenced by access, mentoring, data, and policy literacy.

Tabel 3. KWT Policy Input Conditions

Component	Empirical Finding	Implication
Institutional capacity	31 KWTs and 613 members	Social capital for interest articulation
Regulation	No specific local regulation for KWT strengthening	Policy sustainability remains weak
Mentoring	Number of extension workers decreased from 14 to 3	Mentoring intensity declined
Needs	Facilities, mentoring, sustainability, markets, institutions	Become advocacy agendas

Source: Research analysis, 2026.

Policy Process: KWT Advocacy Mechanism

The advocacy process begins with groups' experiences in carrying out activities and identifying needs. These needs are then articulated through group leaders, extension workers, direct communication, government forums, and stakeholder networks. The findings show that KWTs have spaces for participation, but most participation remains at the level of conveying aspirations, providing information, and implementing programs. Involvement in strategic decisions remains limited.

Extension workers are important linking actors between KWTs and government. However, the decline in the number of extension workers reduces communication and facilitation capacity. At the same time, KWTs use institutional relationships and available forums to convey their needs. Local government, technical agencies, KWTs, community leaders, NGOs, and the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) constitute part of the interaction arena.

Analytically, the advocacy mechanism can be summarized as: problem → aspiration → actor/target → strategy → interaction → response. This distinction indicates that not every interaction constitutes advocacy. Advocacy is characterized by an interest being pursued and an effort to influence the response of a party with authority or influence.

The findings also show that policy changes more often take the form of facilitation, adjustment of support, strengthening of activities, or improved access to programs rather than formal regulatory change. This finding is important because the effectiveness of local advocacy is not always demonstrated by the creation of a new policy, but may be reflected in changes in government responses to needs expressed by the community.

Tabel 4. . Evidence Matrix of the Advocacy Process

Problem	Aspiration	Target	Strategy/Arena	Response
Limited production facilities	Production input support	Government/ local agencies	Forums and communication	Program facilitation
Limited mentoring	Increased mentoring	DP3/extension workers	Communication and coordination	Mentoring according to capacity
Program sustainability	Sustained support	Local government	Aspirations and networks	Integrated through sectoral programs
Market access	Marketing support	Government/partners	Networking	Facilitation and market opportunities

Source: Research analysis, 2026

Policy Output: Policy Responses

Policy output refers to observable responses following policy interaction. In this study, outputs include program support, facility facilitation, training and mentoring, capacity building, and institutional strengthening. Thesis survey data indicate relatively positive perceptions regarding government attention to issues proposed by KWTs, group participation in forums, and the ability of advocacy to encourage programs or activities.

However, these outputs have not all become institutionalized policies. Some forms of support still depend on sectoral programs and mentoring capacity. Therefore, assistance or training cannot automatically be classified as an advocacy outcome. The advocacy–output relationship is considered strong only when there is an identifiable connection between the aspirations expressed and the form of government response.

Tabel 5. Policy Output Indicators

Indikator	Skor	Makna
Indicator	Score	Meaning
Government attention to issues proposed by KWTs	3.93	Relatively positive
KWT participation in policy forums	3.91	Relatively positive

Source: Research analysis, 2026

Policy Outcome: Food Security and Well-Being

Outcomes reflect changes that occur after groups receive support and conduct activities. Research data show that KWT vegetable production increased from 620.12 quintals in 2022 to 1,257.80 quintals in 2025. The recorded production value/income at the group level increased from approximately IDR 770,367,660 to IDR 2,040,364,800.

The increase indicates developments in production and economic activities, but cannot be attributed solely to advocacy. Changes in production are influenced by program support, group capacity, facilities, markets, environmental conditions, mentoring, and household factors. Therefore, these data are used as outcome evidence rather than as proof of a single causal relationship.

In terms of food, KWT activities strengthen food availability and access at the household and community levels through local production and home-garden utilization. Economically, activities may generate sales and savings in food expenditure. In terms of capacity, group experience and mentoring improve technical and organizational abilities. Socially, KWTs expand networks, learning opportunities, and participation.

Quantitative testing in the thesis produced a regression coefficient of 1.036, $t = 23.507$, $p < 0.001$, and $R^2 = 69.6\%$. These findings indicate a positive relationship within the thesis model. However, the results should be interpreted together with the qualitative findings, which show that the relationship between advocacy and well-being operates through policy responses, access to resources, capacity strengthening, and productive activities.

Well-being also varies among KWTs. Differences in organizational capacity, land, facilities, market access, mentoring intensity, and participation mean that the same output may generate different outcomes. Therefore, policy responses need to consider the specific conditions of each group.

Tabel 6. Development of KWT Outcomes, 2022–2025

Indicator	2022	2025	Change
Vegetable production	620.12 quintals	1,257.80 quintals	+102.8%
Recorded production value/income	IDR 770,367,660	IDR 2,040,364,800	+164.8%

Source: Research analysis, 2026.

Implications for Public Administration

The findings show that KWTs need to be positioned as policy actors rather than merely beneficiaries. KWTs possess local knowledge concerning production, food, and economic issues that can serve as policy inputs. Public participation therefore needs to move beyond simply participating in programs toward involvement in problem identification, needs formulation, and evaluation.

Advocacy also functions as a feedback mechanism in the policy cycle. Implementation experiences generate new problems and needs that can be re-articulated through advocacy. The cycle can be formulated as: implementation → community experience → aspirations → advocacy → policy response/adjustment.

Another implication is the need for more substantive collaborative governance. Cross-sectoral coordination should be directed toward data exchange, role sharing, joint solution development, and joint evaluation. For local government, practical priorities include institutionalizing advocacy forums, strengthening KWT policy capacity, strengthening mentoring, developing a KWT database, integrating aspirations into planning and budgeting, and implementing outcome-based monitoring.

Conclusion

This study shows that food security policy advocacy in Tanjungpinang City is a process that connects community needs with government responses through four policy dimensions. At the policy input level, KWTs possess substantial institutional capital through 31 groups and 613 members, together with regulatory and program support, but still face limitations in policy literacy, mentoring capacity, and support sustainability. The decline in the number of extension workers from 14 to 3 indicates that the capacity of the linkage between government and community is an important factor in the advocacy process.

At the policy process level, advocacy takes place through problem identification, interest articulation, communication, forums, networking, coordination, and negotiation. KWTs have participated in conveying aspirations and implementing programs, but their influence on strategic decisions remains limited. Thus, the advocacy process has developed but has not yet become a fully institutionalized participation mechanism.

At the policy output level, government responses include programs, facilitation, mentoring, capacity strengthening, and institutional support. Survey data indicate relatively positive perceptions of government attention and KWT involvement. However, most outputs remain dependent on sectoral programs and have not fully become permanent policy mechanisms.

At the policy outcome level, there are developments in production, economic activity, food access, capacity, and social benefits. KWT vegetable production increased from 620.12 quintals in 2022 to 1,257.80 quintals in 2025. The recorded production value/income also increased. However, these improvements cannot be stated to be caused solely by advocacy because outcomes are influenced by various internal and external factors.

The main conclusion is that policy advocacy functions as an intermediary mechanism connecting community needs with policy responses. Its implications for well-being are indirect, operating through improved policy responsiveness, access to resources, group capacity, productive activities, and food, economic, and social benefits. These findings position KWTs as policy actors and reinforce the importance of collaborative governance in urban food security policy.

Recommendations

Local governments and policymakers should strengthen their commitment to community-based food security policy by increasing budget allocations, strengthening regulations, and increasing the number of agricultural extension workers and assistants. The government should also promote cross-sectoral synergy among government, academia, community organizations, and local communities to ensure more effective,

integrated, and sustainable program implementation. Periodic policy evaluation is essential to ensure that implemented programs have tangible effects on productivity, income, and community well-being, particularly among KWT members.

The Tanjungpinang City Government is recommended to develop and enact a local regulation on community-based food security as a stronger and more operational legal foundation. Such regulation is important to provide policy certainty, strengthen community-group institutions, ensure budget sustainability, improve production facilities, and promote cross-sectoral collaboration in developing local food security.

KWTs are encouraged to continue strengthening institutional capacity, production skills, local food business innovation, and marketing networks to sustainably improve group productivity and income. KWTs should also strengthen organizational solidarity, utilize agricultural technology, actively participate in training, and increase their participation in policy advocacy so that group needs and aspirations can be better incorporated into regional development.

Government and KWTs should collectively strengthen collaboration through comprehensive policies, production-facility support, continuous training, improved community policy literacy, and food programs based on local potential. The involvement of academia, the private sector, social organizations, and communities should be expanded to strengthen a more inclusive policy advocacy ecosystem. Advocacy media, food and nutrition literacy, and continuous monitoring and evaluation should also be strengthened so that policy implementation becomes more effective and participatory and can create self-reliant and sustainable food security oriented toward the well-being of Tanjungpinang City residents.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Tanjungpinang City Government, particularly the Department of Agriculture, Food, and Fisheries of Tanjungpinang City, for the permission, data support, and opportunity provided for this research. Appreciation is also extended to all parties who were willing to provide their time, information, data, and explanations during the data collection process. The authors also express their appreciation to the supervisors and lecturers of the Master of Public Administration Program at Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji for their guidance, suggestions, and academic support during the preparation of this study. Finally, the authors thank their families and colleagues for their continuous moral support and motivation throughout the completion of the research.

References

- Anderson, JE (2015). *Pembuatan kebijakan publik: Sebuah pengantar* (edisi ke-8). Cengage Learning.
- Badan Pangan Nasional. (2025). Laporan Triwulanan II; 2025. Dalam *Laporan Triwulanan II; 2025*.
- Berita Statistik Resmi. (2025). *Kemiskinan di Indonesia September 2024*. 7 (07).
- BPS Tanjungpinang. (2026). *Kota Tanjungpinang Dalam Angka 2026*. Jilid 18 Tahun 2026
- Dunn, WN (2020). *Analisis kebijakan publik: Sebuah pengantar* (edisi ke-6). Routledge.

- Organisasi Pangan dan Pertanian Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa. (2023). *Sistem pangan berkelanjutan dan keterlibatan masyarakat* (Edisi Juli).
- Lestari, D. (2024). Pemberdayaan masyarakat sebagai strategi advokasi untuk kebijakan pangan berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Pengembangan dan Kebijakan Pangan* , 6 (2) , 33–50.
- Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (2008). *Penelitian partisipatif berbasis komunitas untuk kesehatan: Dari proses ke hasil* ((edisi ke-2).). Jossey-Bass.
- Mulyani, R. (2022). Strategi advokasi masyarakat dalam pengembangan pertanian perkotaan. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik dan Pembangunan* , 4 (2) , 45–60.
- Peraturan Daerah Kota Tanjungpinang Nomor 11 Tahun 2024 tentang Tata Ruang Daerah (RTRW) 2024-2044 (2024).
- Prasetyo, A. (2021). Peran komunitas pertanian dalam advokasi kebijakan pangan regional. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat* , 3 (1) , 23–38.
- Program dan Kebijakan Ketahanan Pangan Nasional (2024).
- Rahmawati, S. (2020). Advokasi kebijakan berbasis komunitas dalam memperkuat ketahanan pangan lokal. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan* , 2 (3) , 12–29.
- RPJMN, 32 167 (2024).
- Siregar, H. (2023). Model kolaborasi pemerintah dan masyarakat dalam kebijakan ketahanan pangan di wilayah kepulauan. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik* , 5 (1) , 77–91.
- Sumarno, Hanif Nurcholis, Augustin Rina Herawati. (2026). Analisis Kartu Indonesia Pintar Melalui Perspektif George C. Edwards III di Kabupaten Gringsing. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Administrasi Publik* , 8 (1), 14–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24036/jmiap.v8i1.1340>.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 18, 66 37 (2012).
- Program Pangan Dunia (WFP). (2024). *Laporan kelaparan global 2024: Laporan negara Indonesia* . <https://www.wfp.org>