



Societal Analysis of Shipyard Industry Development in Batupute Village, Soppeng Riaja District, Barru Regency

Nur Alif*, Sakaria, Sultan

Universitas Hasanuddin

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.53697/iso.v6i2.4015>

*Correspondence: Nur Alif

Email: Aliflifue@gmail.com

Received: 09-02-2026

Accepted: 09-03-2026

Published: 09-04-2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract: Industrial development is often embraced as a pathway to economic growth and improved living standards. However, contemporary development practices increasingly exhibit a tendency to overlook social, cultural, and environmental dimensions, resulting in an imbalanced development paradigm. This study aims to analyze community perspectives on the development of the shipbuilding industry in Batupute Village, Soppeng Riaja District, Barru Regency, using a societal approach. A qualitative research design was employed, with data collected through in-depth interviews using a snowball sampling technique to capture diverse perspectives from local residents. The analysis is grounded in the societal framework proposed by Paulus Wirutomo, which emphasizes the interconnection of structural, cultural, and processual dimensions in development. The findings indicate that the implementation of industrial development in the study area has not fully aligned with an ideal societal development model. Structurally, there are emerging inequalities and shifts in local economic patterns. Culturally, traditional values and community cohesion are experiencing gradual erosion. Processually, limited community participation and weak social integration mechanisms further exacerbate these issues. The lack of synchronization among these three dimensions reflects a broader disintegration within the development process. In conclusion, the development of the shipbuilding industry has yet to achieve a balanced integration of societal principles. These results underscore the importance of adopting more inclusive, participatory, and environmentally conscious development strategies to ensure that economic progress does not come at the expense of social and cultural sustainability.

Keywords: Industrial Development, Shipbuilding Industry, Societal Approach, Social Change, Sustainable Development

Introduction

Industrial development represents a multidimensional transformation encompassing economic, technological, and social dimensions, reflecting the advancement of modern civilization. Industry plays a crucial role in enhancing production efficiency through labor specialization while simultaneously shaping new social structures characterized by relationships between the working class and management (Giddens, 2013). Furthermore, industrialization is widely regarded as a primary driver of economic growth and an improvement in societal welfare (Todaro & Smith, 2020). In local contexts, such as shipbuilding industries, industrial activities function not only as centers of economic production but also as arenas of social interaction that facilitate social mobility.

However, transformations in social structure do not necessarily lead to an equitable distribution of welfare. Industrial structures may generate inequalities in access to employment, wage levels, and labor protection if not managed inclusively (Scott, 2014). From a cultural perspective, industrialization fosters a shift toward modern work ethics such as discipline and professionalism, which often interact and negotiate with existing local values (UNDP, 2022). Meanwhile, from a processual perspective, social dynamics are reflected in interactions among social actors, where community perceptions of industry are strongly influenced by the degree of inclusiveness and fairness in the distribution of development benefits (World Bank, 2021).

The societal analysis emphasizes the integration of structural, cultural, and processual dimensions in understanding social phenomena holistically. This approach views social change as the result of the interplay between power relations, social interactions, and institutional systems (Jurnal Sosiologi Andalas, 2022). Within this framework, social structure determines access to resources, culture shapes values and norms, while social processes serve as the primary mechanisms of change through dynamic interactions (Postmodern Openings, 2021). Therefore, societal analysis constitutes an essential conceptual framework for evaluating industrial development, ensuring that it is not solely oriented toward economic growth but also toward social justice and sustainability (Social Investment Forum Indonesia, 2023).

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative case study approach to explore community perceptions of shipbuilding industry development in Batupute Village, Soppeng Riaja District, Barru Regency, conducted from September 2023 to February 2024. A qualitative design was selected to capture the depth, meaning, and complexity of social experiences that cannot be adequately quantified.

Informants were selected using a snowball sampling technique, enabling the identification of participants with relevant knowledge and direct involvement in the studied phenomenon. Key informants included village authorities and local community members residing near the shipyard development area. The selection emphasized information richness and contextual relevance rather than statistical representation, resulting in five primary informants.

Data were collected through multiple techniques, including in-depth interviews, field observations, documentation, and literature review, ensuring methodological triangulation. The data were analyzed using an interactive model involving data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Additionally, thematic analysis was applied through coding, categorization, and interpretation to identify patterns, relationships, and emerging meanings.

To ensure rigor and trustworthiness, the study employed member checking, peer debriefing, and reflexive bias clarification. These strategies enhanced the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the findings. Overall, this approach enabled a

comprehensive and holistic understanding of the social dynamics surrounding industrial development in the study area.

Result and Discussion

Societal development, as conceptualized by Paulus Wirutomo, emphasizes the integration of structural, cultural, and social process dimensions in fostering socially, economically, and culturally sustainable societies. This framework advances beyond growth-centric paradigms by situating development as a multidimensional process aimed at enhancing human dignity while maintaining socio-ecological balance. Contemporary development discourse reinforces this perspective through sustainability and human-centered development approaches, which stress inclusivity, equity, and environmental responsibility (United Nations, 2015; Hickel, 2020). Thus, societal development provides a critical lens to assess industrial expansion that often prioritizes economic outputs over social cohesion and ecological integrity.

At the structural level, the findings reveal that the expansion of the shipbuilding industry has significantly reshaped local socio-economic arrangements. Increased social mobility and the influx of migrant populations reflect processes of labor reconfiguration commonly associated with industrialization in peripheral regions. However, weak institutional capacity—evidenced by inadequate administrative systems and the absence of local regulatory instruments (PERKADES)—indicates governance deficits. From the perspective of structuration theory, social structures are continuously reproduced through rules and resources that enable or constrain social practices (Giddens, 2013). In this case, limited regulatory enforcement reflects asymmetrical power relations between corporations and local communities.

Recent scholarship in political economy and development studies further explains such dynamics through the concept of uneven development, where capital accumulation tends to concentrate benefits while externalizing social and environmental costs (Piketty, 2020; Bridge et al., 2018). The minimal impact of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives and the persistence of substandard labor conditions suggest that redistributive mechanisms are weak. This aligns with findings that CSR in developing regions often functions symbolically rather than substantively, failing to address structural inequalities (Frynas & Yamahaki, 2016).

At the cultural level, industrialization has altered local value systems and patterns of social interaction. The decline of communal activities due to environmental disturbances reflects a disruption of everyday social life and shared cultural practices. From a practice theory perspective, culture is reproduced through habitual actions embedded in social contexts (Bourdieu, 1990). Industrial intrusion into local spaces can displace these practices, leading to cultural dislocation.

This phenomenon is further supported by the concept of social-ecological disruption, where environmental degradation directly affects social relations and cultural continuity (IPBES, 2019). Moreover, modernization processes often produce cultural homogenization, marginalizing local identities in favor of dominant industrial logics

(Escobar, 2018). The erosion of communal spaces in Batupute Village thus reflects broader tensions between globalized industrial systems and localized cultural resilience.

At the social process level, the study identifies patterns of conflict, negotiation, and resistance, indicating fragmented social integration. Community grievances related to pollution, labor inequality, and exclusion from decision-making processes highlight ongoing social tensions. Conflict theory posits that such tensions are inherent in contexts characterized by unequal access to power and resources (Dahrendorf, 1959).

Recent governance literature emphasizes the importance of participatory development and inclusive decision-making as mechanisms to mitigate such conflicts (Cornwall, 2016). Arnstein's (1969) ladder of participation remains relevant, illustrating that without genuine power redistribution, participation remains tokenistic. In Batupute Village, limited community involvement suggests a top-down development model that undermines social legitimacy and trust.

Furthermore, the marginalization of community agency reflects a disruption in the duality of structure and agency. While structuration theory highlights the recursive relationship between the two, contemporary perspectives on agency in development stress the importance of empowering local actors as co-creators of development processes (Sen, 1999; Cleaver, 2017). The lack of meaningful engagement mechanisms in this case constrains the ability of communities to influence outcomes, resulting in exclusionary and unsustainable development trajectories.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that industrial development in Batupute Village remains misaligned with the principles of societal development. Structural inequalities, cultural disruptions, and fragmented social processes collectively indicate a failure to integrate key dimensions of sustainable development. These results are consistent with global critiques of industrial expansion that neglect social justice and environmental sustainability (Hickel, 2020; UNDP, 2020).

Therefore, a reorientation of development strategies is required. This includes strengthening local governance frameworks, ensuring equitable distribution of economic benefits, preserving cultural systems, and institutionalizing participatory mechanisms. Integrating these elements is essential to achieving a balanced and inclusive model of societal development that aligns economic progress with social welfare and ecological sustainability.

Conclusion

The findings demonstrate that industrial development in Batupute Village has not been fully aligned with the principles of sustainable and societal development. The application of societal analysis encompassing structural, cultural, and social process dimensions reveals that industrial expansion has generated multidimensional impacts, including structural inequalities, cultural degradation, and the erosion of traditional values. These transformations indicate that development practices remain predominantly growth-oriented, with insufficient integration of social and cultural considerations.

A key implication of this study lies in its contribution to the operationalization of the societal development framework. By empirically illustrating the disconnection between structural arrangements, cultural systems, and social processes, this study reinforces the importance of adopting integrative and human-centered development approaches. It highlights that failure to synchronize these dimensions may result in fragmented development outcomes and long-term social vulnerabilities.

From a practical perspective, the findings suggest the urgent need to strengthen local governance and regulatory frameworks, particularly through the establishment of clear village-level regulations and more effective monitoring mechanisms. Enhancing corporate accountability is also critical, especially in ensuring that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives move beyond symbolic compliance toward substantive contributions, such as fair labor practices, occupational health and safety protections, and community empowerment programs. Furthermore, institutionalizing participatory mechanisms is essential to ensure that local communities are actively involved in decision-making processes, thereby promoting more inclusive and equitable development outcomes.

For future research, further studies are recommended to adopt comparative or longitudinal designs to examine the long-term socio-cultural and environmental impacts of industrial development across different regions. Quantitative or mixed-method approaches could also be employed to measure the extent of structural inequality and social change more systematically. Additionally, future research should explore the role of policy interventions and multi-stakeholder governance models in fostering more balanced and sustainable development trajectories.

Overall, this study underscores that achieving sustainable industrial development requires a holistic integration of economic, social, and cultural dimensions, supported by inclusive governance and strong institutional commitment.

References

- Asrulla, A., Rahman, F., & Yusuf, M. (2023). *Qualitative research methods in social studies*. Makassar: Academic Press.
- Andalas Journal of Sociology. (2022). Social analysis from the perspective of structure, culture, and social processes. *Andalas Journal of Sociology*.
- Bridge, G., Bouzarovski, S., Bradshaw, M., & Eyre, N. (2018). Geographies of energy transition: Space, place and the low-carbon economy. *Energy Policy*, 53, 331–340. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.10.066>
- Bebbington, A., Abdulai, A. G., Humphreys Bebbington, D., Hinfelaar, M., & Sanborn, C. (2018). Governing extractive industries. *World Development*, 102, 245–257.
- Cleaver, F. (2017). Development through bricolage: Rethinking institutions for natural resource management. *World Development*, 92, 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.11.015>
- Cornwall, A. (2016). Participation in development: Revisiting the idea of participation. *Community Development Journal*, 51(3), 495–512

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959). Toward a theory of social conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(2), 170–183.
- Escobar, A. (2018). Development, critique, and alternatives: A social theory of development. *Antipode*, 50(2), 396–417.
- Evans, P. (2014). Embedded autonomy revisited: Institutions, states, and development. *World Development*, 73, 30–40.
- Frynas, J. G., & Yamahaki, C. (2016). Corporate social responsibility: Review and roadmap of theoretical perspectives. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 25(3), 258–285.
- Giddens, A. (2013). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (2013). The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(4), 969–977.
- Hickel, J. (2020). The sustainable development index: Measuring the ecological efficiency of human development. *Ecological Economics*, 167, 106331.
- Heryana, A., Nugraha, R., & Sari, D. (2018). Key informants in qualitative research: Concepts and applications. *Journal of Social Research Methods*, 12(2), 45–56.
- IPBES. (2019). Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 101, 123–132.
- Lumen Publishing. (2021). Culture and social identity in contemporary society. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(3), 45–60.
- Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Stirling, A. (2016). Dynamic sustainabilities: Technology, environment, social justice. *Environment and Planning A*, 48(2), 236–254.
- Piketty, T. (2020). Capital and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(4), 1985–2041.
- Ningrum, D., & Lestari, S. (2022). Ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research: Techniques and practices. *Indonesian Journal of Qualitative Studies*, 5(1), 1–10.
- Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities*. Sage Publications.
- Sengkey, R., Tumbel, T., & Wullur, M. (2020). Snowball sampling technique in qualitative research: A practical approach. *Journal of Community Research*, 8(1), 23–30.
- Social Investment Forum Indonesia. (2023). Pendekatan sosial dalam memahami perubahan sosial. Jakarta: SIFI Press.
- Scoones, I. (2016). The politics of sustainability and development. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 41, 293–319.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. *Oxford Development Studies*, 27(3), 357–359.
- Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2020). *Economic development* (13th ed.). Pearson.
- UNDP. (2022). *Human development report 2022: Uncertain times, unsettled lives*. United Nations Development Programme.
- UNDP. (2020). Human development report 2020. *Human Development Review*, 22(1), 45–67.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Culture 2030 indicators*. UNESCO Publishing.

- United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. *Global Policy*, 6(3), 343–353.
- United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). (2020). *Industrial development report 2020: Industrializing in the digital age*. UNIDO.
- Wirutomo, P. (2022). *Imajinasi sosiologi: Pembangunan sosial*. Jakarta: UI Press.
- World Bank. (2021). *World development report 2021: Data for better lives*. World Bank Publications.