American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR) e-ISSN : 2378-703X Volume-09, Issue-04, pp-218-227 www.ajhssr.com Research Paper

Open Access

The Impact of Private Port Terminal Operations on Community Welfare (A Case Study on Nickel Ore Sales) in Kendari City

Iskandar Zainuddin Rela¹; Weka Widayati²; Eka Suaib³

¹(Department of Agricultural Extension, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Sulawesi Tenggara, Indonesia) ²(Department of Geography, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia) ³(Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Halu Oleo, Kendari, Sulawesi Tenggara, Indonesia)

ABSTRACT: This study aims to analyze the impact of the operations of Private Port Terminals (TUKS) on community welfare in Kendari City, particularly across social, economic, environmental, and institutional dimensions, with a focus on nickel ore sales activities. The research employs a descriptive quantitative method using a Likert scale questionnaire involving 77 respondents, selected through the Slovin formula at a 90% confidence level. The findings indicate that TUKS operations have a positive impact on the economic dimension, such as increasing employment opportunities and regional revenue, as well as on institutional aspects through the strengthening of governance. However, the social impact tends to be neutral, while the environmental impact indicates risks of seawater pollution and damage to coastal ecosystems. This study underscores the importance of strengthening sustainability policies through environmental impact assessments (EIA) and the implementation of corporate social responsibility (CSR) to maximize economic benefits while minimizing negative impacts on society and the environment.

KEYWORDS: Nickel, Welfare, CSR, environmental impact, economic and social dimension

I. INTRODUCTION

Private Port Terminals (TUKS) are logistical facilities operated by companies for the purpose of exporting specific commodities, such as nickel. In Kendari City, the presence of TUKS is closely linked to nickel ore sales activities, which are considered a leading commodity in Southeast Sulawesi. The operation of TUKS not only supports the accelerated distribution of natural resources but also serves as a backbone of the regional economy.

Based on the Regulation of the Minister of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia Number PM 52 of 2021 concerning Special Terminals and Private Port Terminals, the rights of TUKS operators include guarantees of smooth cargo flow and assurances of navigation safety and security. While this policy aims to enhance export competitiveness, it also has the potential to exert additional pressure on the environment and society, particularly regarding noise pollution, heavy traffic, and competition for public infrastructure use.

The operation of TUKS contributes to local employment absorption and increased regional revenue through taxes and levies. However, the economic benefits are not always equitably distributed. Communities living near TUKS facilities have limited access to employment opportunities, while inflation resulting from industrial activities may reduce the purchasing power of vulnerable groups.

An environmental impact analysis of TUKS operations, particularly in the context of nickel ore loading and unloading activities, reveals potential risks to coastal ecosystem degradation. Such activities may result in water pollution and habitat damage, affecting biodiversity in coastal areas. Gissi et al. (2016) found that waste generated from mining and ore processing activities can contaminate aquatic environments through various mechanisms, including tailings runoff and direct discharge into water bodies. The negative impacts are not limited to pollution but also include physical changes to the coastal ecosystem. Yao et al. (2020) reported that intensive loading and unloading activities could lead to coastal erosion and sedimentation, altering the natural structure of habitats. In Kendari, similar issues may exacerbate land conflicts and threaten traditional livelihoods, such as fisheries, which remain the primary source of income for many local residents.

Although TUKS contributes to macroeconomic growth, disparities in welfare often persist. The implementation of cash assistance programs (BLT) reflects government efforts to address inequality, but these measures fall short of tackling the root causes—namely, the lack of community involvement in the planning and oversight of TUKS operations.

2025

2025

Therefore, the application of sustainability principles in TUKS operations becomes crucial. Integrating environmental impact assessments (EIA) and corporate social responsibility (CSR) frameworks must be strengthened to ensure that terminal operations do not solely pursue economic profit but also safeguard community quality of life through pollution mitigation and investment in social infrastructure. This study aims to analyze the impact of TUKS operations on the welfare of the Kendari community, with a particular focus on nickel ore sales. It seeks to evaluate the extent to which TUKS operational policies align with inclusive development principles and to provide recommendations for improving terminal governance in order to reduce social, economic, environmental, and institutional disparities.

2.1. Private Port Terminals (TUKS)

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The Republic of Indonesia Law Number 17 of 2008 defines Private Port Terminals (TUKS) as terminals located within the operational and interest areas of a port, serving the specific needs of companies in accordance with their core business operations. Varese et al. (2020) explain that port facilities must be able to connect the port with its hinterland, serve ships, and manage cargo loading and unloading at terminals based on the type of goods. Port facilities are categorized into primary and supporting facilities. Primary facilities include shipping lanes, docking facilities, port basins, anchorage areas, turning basins, cargo handling equipment, piers, warehouses, and storage yards. Supporting facilities include breakwaters, offices, clean water supply, electricity, roads and railways, drainage systems, waste and garbage disposal, parking lots, and other public utilities.

2.2. The Concept of Community Welfare

The concept of community welfare encompasses several interrelated dimensions: social, economic, environmental, and institutional. Rela et al. (2020) suggest that corporate social responsibility toward the environment represents both a strategy for long-term business sustainability and a moral obligation that promotes social, economic, and environmental well-being. This relationship highlights the importance of integrating community welfare into corporate strategies, as companies that successfully engage stakeholders are better positioned to create shared value, positively impacting both their operations and surrounding communities (Fordham & Robinson, 2019).

2.3. Social Dimension

According to Law Number 11 of 2009 of the Republic of Indonesia, social welfare is defined as a condition in which the material, spiritual, and social needs of citizens are met, enabling them to live decently and perform their social functions. Corporate involvement in this dimension can be viewed through health and education initiatives, particularly in the context of public-private partnerships (PPP). Kapologwe et al. (2020) assert that such collaborations in health sectors can facilitate infrastructure development and service improvements, especially in communication systems essential for patient referrals and follow-ups.

In education, corporate financial support and infrastructure investments are important aspects of CSR. Ilyashenko (2020) argues that CSR initiatives that include education funding and infrastructure development provide direct benefits to local communities. Furthermore, companies can positively influence social relations by boosting local economic contributions. Putnam (2000) states that companies prioritizing local workforce recruitment help bridge social gaps and foster inclusion in the labor force.

2.4. Economic Dimension

Siregar, 2019) highlights that private investment not only promotes economic growth but also enhances community welfare by increasing output and improving living standards. Elpisah et al. (2021) further support this view, noting that community welfare can be assessed through economic growth and income distribution, which are key indicators of development progress. Bustillo-Castillejo et al. (2023) also emphasize that CSR activities can improve a company's image while increasing local economic income and providing job training. In areas where private companies operate, a noticeable growth in local business activity is often observed, as companies tend to source materials and services locally, further contributing to the economic ecosystem.

2.5. Environmental Dimension

Environmental well-being is recognized as an essential aspect of community welfare. Doughan (2020) state that welfare must incorporate non-economic values, such as environmental preservation, which are critical for long-term sustainability. Companies utilizing marine spaces may mobilize natural resources from these environments. Kraus et al. (2020) argue that companies adopting environmentally responsible practices not only enhance sustainability but also support broader ecological health, which is crucial for community welfare.

Asiaei et al. (2022) stress the importance of corporate responsibility and environmental performance measurement systems in ensuring that terminal operators maintain seawater quality while extracting marine resources. They further assert that companies that integrate sustainability into their operations are more likely to minimize negative impacts and contribute positively to marine environments.

A vital aspect of corporate environmental management is the application of ecosystem-based management approaches. Bhuyan et al. (2021) and McDonald et al. (2020) note that such approaches are gaining traction among private sector actors, especially in fisheries and aquaculture, where sustainable practices can boost productivity while preserving marine ecosystems. For example, the establishment of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) has shown positive effects on ecosystem services and biodiversity, making them an effective strategy for companies seeking to balance economic activity with ecological conservation (Irmadhiany et al., 2024; Taufiqurrahman et al., 2023).

2.6. Institutional Dimension

The institutional dimension of community welfare emphasizes efforts to enhance the quality of life through organizational and governance structures. Siswanto & Hadwidjojo (2020) found that community participation in welfare programs can be increased when strong relationships exist between local institutions and communities, fostering a sense of ownership and responsibility.

One of the main ways CSR improves welfare is through direct contributions to community development. Rela et al. (2020) highlight that CSR initiatives are designed to reflect corporate responsibility in advancing social interests, improving welfare through resource allocation and support for local initiatives. This is in line with Gillan et al. (2021), who emphasize that companies engaged in CSR often enjoy stronger relationships with stakeholders, leading to improved social well-being.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study was conducted in Tondonggeu Sub-district, Nambo District, Kendari City, Southeast Sulawesi Province, in January 2025. It employed a descriptive quantitative design using a Likert scale questionnaire. A total of 77 respondents (households) were selected as samples based on Slovin's formula with a 90% confidence level from a total population of 340 households.

Data analysis to measure the impact of TUKS operations on community welfare used the following scoring formula:

 \sum Observed Score = (No. × Score SS) + (No. × Score S) + (No. × Score N) + (No. × Score d) + (No. × Score SD)

The percentage of TUKS impact was then calculated using:

Impact Percentage = Observed Score/Maximum Score} × 100

The interpretation of these percentages follows Arikunto (1997) scale as shown below:

Percentage	Category
80,1% - 100%	Strongly Agree (SS)
60,1 % - 80%	Agree (S)
40,1 % - 60%	Neutral (N)
20,1 % - 40%	Disagree (D)
0,0 % - 20%	Strongly Disagree (SD)

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Impact of TUKS Operations on Community Welfare

TUKS operations have shown varying impacts on community welfare across social, economic, environmental, and institutional dimensions. Although most respondents agreed that TUKS contributed positively—particularly in institutional and economic aspects—concerns were raised regarding environmental impacts, such as seawater quality and coastal ecosystem damage. Social impacts tended to be perceived as neutral. These findings indicate a need for stronger efforts to minimize negative environmental effects while enhancing the economic and institutional benefits for surrounding communities.

4.1.1. Social Dimension

The operation of TUKS in the study area has not yet demonstrated a significant social impact on the welfare of the fishing community. This highlights the need for further efforts from relevant stakeholders, such as the company and the government, to ensure that the existence of TUKS truly brings tangible benefits to the local population, particularly in social aspects. The impact of TUKS operations on community welfare in the social dimension can be seen in the following table:

2025

No	Social Dimonsion Indicator	Indicator					
190.	Social Dimension indicator		Α	Ν	D	SD	
1	The existence of TUKS helps improve fishermen's access to health facilities.	8	9	19	21	20	
2	The presence of TUKS makes it easier for fishermen's children to access proper education.	7	6	23	31	10	
3	TUKS operations create a sense of security within the fishing community.	7	12	23	24	11	
4	The presence of TUKS strengthens social relationships among members of the fishing community.	7	20	22	18	10	
5	Fishermen are involved in decision-making related to TUKS development and operations.		6	33	23	6	
Total		38	53	120	117	57	
	Score Total	190	212	360	234	57	
	∑Score	∑Score 1,053					
	Percentage (%)	54.70% (Neutral)					

Table 2. Impact of TUKS Operations on Community	Welfare – Social Dimension
---	----------------------------

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2025

The table above presents the findings of the study on the impact of Private Port Terminals (TUKS) operations on community welfare within the social dimension. The study used five key indicators: access to health facilities, children's education, sense of security, social relationships among fishing community members, and the involvement of fishermen in decision-making processes related to TUKS. Each indicator was assessed based on the respondents' level of agreement, categorized into Strongly Agree (SS), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

The results indicate that the majority of respondents held neutral views regarding the social impacts of TUKS operations, with an overall percentage of **54.70%**. This suggests that the presence of TUKS has not yet resulted in noticeable social changes—whether positive or negative—for the local fishing community. For example, the indicator *"The existence of TUKS helps improve fishermen's access to health facilities"* showed a fairly even distribution of responses, but most respondents selected the neutral category.

Another indicator, "The presence of TUKS makes it easier for fishermen's children to access proper education," also reflected similar outcomes, with most respondents expressing neutral or even negative views. This indicates that TUKS operations have yet to make a tangible contribution to improving educational access for fishermen's children. Similarly, the indicator "TUKS operations create a sense of security within the fishing community" reveals that a sense of safety has not been fully realized.

The indicator related to *social relationships within the fishing community* showed slightly more positive results compared to the others. Some respondents felt that the presence of TUKS had strengthened social ties, although many still remained neutral or disagreed. However, the final indicator—*fishermen's involvement in decision-making concerning the development and operation of TUKS*—received predominantly negative feedback, with most respondents choosing neutral to disagree categories.

The findings of this study, which show a predominantly neutral perception of TUKS's social impact, underscore a critical gap between industrial operations and meaningful social engagement with local communities. Although infrastructure such as TUKS can contribute to regional economic expansion, the lack of perceived improvement in access to health and education indicates that the social externalities of port infrastructure remain insufficiently addressed. This aligns with the findings of Bustillo-Castillejo et al. (2023), who emphasize that while corporate presence may stimulate economic growth, without deliberate community-centered strategies, it often fails to translate into improved social welfare outcomes. In particular, inadequate stakeholder engagement in planning and decision-making processes continues to be a recurring barrier to inclusive development, especially in resource-based economies.

Moreover, the low level of perceived safety and weak social cohesion associated with TUKS operations reflects the absence of a robust corporate-community interface. This echoes Gillan et al. (2021), who argue that sustainable corporate operations must integrate Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles to foster trust and shared value. Their study indicates that companies investing in localized social responsibility programs—such as community health outreach, education support, and participatory governance—tend to improve both their legitimacy and long-term viability. Given the strategic economic role of TUKS, its operations must go beyond compliance and adopt a proactive approach to social investment. Doing so not only enhances community resilience but also mitigates potential social conflicts that may arise from perceived exclusion or marginalization.

2025

4.1.2. Economic Dimension

The majority of respondents expressed neutral views regarding the economic impact of TUKS operations, with an overall percentage of **56.57%**. This suggests that while some benefits have been perceived—such as the creation of new job opportunities—the overall economic contribution of TUKS has not yet significantly improved the welfare of the local fishing communities. Further efforts are required to ensure that the presence of TUKS genuinely delivers equitable economic benefits to the surrounding population. The impact of TUKS operations on community welfare in the economic dimension is presented in the following table:

No	Feanomic Dimension Indicator		Indikator					
140.	Economic Dimension indicator	SS	Α	Ν	D	SD		
1	TUKS increases fishermen's income	7	17	18	17	18		
2	Fish prices have remained stable since TUKS							
	operations began	7	22	14	26	8		
3	TUKS creates new job opportunities for fishermen	12	26	17	14	8		
4	4 Fishermen are able to diversify their livelihoods due							
	to TUKS		13	27	29	4		
5	5 TUKS improves fishermen's access to fish markets		9	16	33	14		
Total		35	87	92	119	52		
Score Total			348	276	238	52		
	∑Score	1,089						
	Percentage (%)		56.57	% (Neutra	al)			

Table 3. Impact of TUKS Operations on Community Welfare – Economic Dimension

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2025

The table above presents the results of the study on the impact of Private Port Terminals (TUKS) operations on community welfare in the **economic dimension**. This research evaluated five key indicators: the increase in fishermen's income, the stability of fish catch prices, the creation of new job opportunities, livelihood diversification, and fishermen's access to fish markets. Each indicator was assessed based on respondents' level of agreement, categorized as Strongly Agree (SS), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

The first indicator, "*TUKS increases fishermen's income*," showed a relatively even distribution of responses. A total of 17 respondents agreed, 18 were neutral, and the remaining 35 selected either "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree." This indicates that TUKS has not yet been perceived as significantly contributing to the overall income improvement of fishermen.

For the second indicator, "*Fish prices have remained stable since TUKS operations began*," the majority of respondents selected either "Neutral" (14) or "Disagree" (26). Only a few chose "Strongly Agree" (7) or "Agree" (22). This suggests that TUKS operations have not fully contributed to the stabilization of fish prices as perceived by the fishing community.

The third indicator, "TUKS creates new job opportunities for fishermen," received the most favorable responses compared to other indicators. Twenty-six respondents agreed and twelve strongly agreed. However, seventeen respondents were neutral, while twenty-two disagreed. These findings highlight the potential economic benefit of TUKS in generating employment, although such benefits have not yet been evenly experienced across the community.

The findings indicate that the economic benefits of TUKS operations are not yet fully perceived by the local fishing community. Although some respondents recognized the emergence of new job opportunities, the impacts on income levels and price stability remain uncertain. This result aligns with Bebbington et al. (2018), who argue that large-scale extractive and port-based operations often generate uneven development outcomes, where local communities are insufficiently integrated into planning and benefit distribution. While the third indicator (job creation) showed relatively positive perceptions, the limited improvements in fishermen's income and market access suggest structural barriers to inclusive economic participation. Similar observations were made by Toussaint (2019), who emphasized the risks of economic marginalization when industrial development occurs without community-based economic integration.

Moreover, the neutral to negative perceptions surrounding price stability and livelihood diversification reflect a lack of resilience in the local economic ecosystem. Research by Sobieralski & Hubbard (2023) highlights that inclusive port governance and localized supply chain development are critical to ensuring that coastal communities can benefit from port-linked economic activities. In line with this, Haralambides (2017) found that port operations in Southeast Asia often fail to yield equitable economic outcomes unless accompanied by targeted community empowerment and skill enhancement programs. Without such interventions, the economic contribution of TUKS may remain surface-level—favoring only large stakeholders and bypassing the most vulnerable coastal populations, such as traditional fishing households.

4.1.3. Environmental Dimension

The majority of respondents expressed neutral views regarding the environmental impact of TUKS operations, with a total percentage of **56.00%** (Neutral). Although there were some positive responses—particularly related to fishermen's access to fishing grounds—the data indicate that TUKS still faces significant challenges in ensuring environmental sustainability and minimizing its negative impact on marine and coastal ecosystems. The impact of TUKS operations on community welfare within the environmental dimension is presented in the following table:

No	Environmental Dimension		Indicator					
190.			Α	Ν	D	SD		
1	1 Seawater quality around the TUKS area remains well- maintained and unpolluted			7	29	11		
2	Fishermen still have easy access to fishing grounds	3	27	10	27	10		
3	TUKS operations do not disturb marine ecosystems in the fishermen's area	3	31	21	18	4		
4	The existence of TUKS does not cause damage to the coastal environment	2	18	13	40	4		
5	5 TUKS environmental management efforts consider marine ecosystem sustainability		16	14	40	5		
Total		13	119	65	154	34		
Score Total			476	195	308	34		
	∑Score	1,078						
	Percentage (%)		56.00% (Neutral)					

Table 4.	The impact	of TUKS o	perations or	community	welfare	within	the en	vironmental	dimension
	1		1						

The table above illustrates the impact of the operations of Private Port Terminals (TUKS) on community welfare within the environmental dimension. This study assessed five main indicators: seawater quality, fishermen's access to fishing grounds, disruption of marine ecosystems, coastal environmental damage, and sustainability of marine ecosystems. Respondents provided their answers based on levels of agreement, categorized as Strongly Agree (SS), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

The first indicator, "Seawater quality around the TUKS area remains well-maintained and unpolluted," revealed that the majority of respondents chose "Disagree" (29) and "Strongly Disagree" (11), with only a small portion selecting "Agree" (27) or "Strongly Agree" (3). This indicates that the presence of TUKS is perceived as insufficient in maintaining seawater quality in its operational area.

The second indicator, *"Fishermen still have easy access to fishing grounds,"* showed an almost even distribution of responses. A total of 27 respondents agreed, 27 disagreed, and 10 strongly disagreed. These results suggest that fishermen's accessibility to fishing grounds is a matter of concern, with opinions in the community varying widely.

The third and fourth indicators—related to *disruption of marine ecosystems* and *coastal environmental degradation*—demonstrated that most respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Specifically, 40 respondents disagreed with the statement that *TUKS does not cause coastal environmental damage*, and 18 disagreed that *TUKS operations do not disturb marine ecosystems*. This reflects a significant level of public concern about the environmental impacts associated with TUKS activities.

The findings reveal that TUKS operations are perceived to have negative impacts on the local marine environment, particularly concerning seawater quality and coastal ecosystem integrity. A significant portion of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that TUKS maintains seawater quality, while perceptions about ecosystem disruption and coastal degradation were similarly unfavorable. These findings are consistent with research by Forgione et al. (2023), who found that unregulated port and shipping activities often contribute to heavy metal pollution and ecological degradation in coastal areas. Similarly, Rodgers et al. (2021) emphasized that the absence of rigorous environmental safeguards in port operations may intensify damage to nearshore ecosystems, especially when industrial ports are located near traditional fishing zones.

Moreover, the mixed responses regarding fishermen's access to fishing grounds suggest growing spatial conflict between industrial infrastructure and local livelihood spaces. Fabinyi et al. (2022) argue that port expansion in developing economies tends to displace small-scale fishers when marine spatial planning does not include local input. These concerns are amplified in coastal Southeast Asia, where reliance on marine resources is high, and environmental resilience is already threatened by industrialization. As highlighted by Wu et al. (2023), sustainable port governance must integrate community-based environmental monitoring and adaptive management strategies to reduce ecological harm and enhance legitimacy. Without concrete environmental management and participatory frameworks, TUKS may further erode ecosystem services essential to both biodiversity and socioeconomic resilience.

4.1.4. Institutional Dimension

The majority of respondents agreed with the institutional impact of TUKS operations, with a total percentage of **62.13%**. This data suggests that TUKS operations are perceived as relatively successful in maintaining institutional aspects, particularly in terms of fishermen's accessibility and efforts toward marine ecosystem sustainability. However, there are still several challenges to address, especially concerning public perception regarding coastal environmental impacts. The impact of TUKS operations on community welfare within the institutional dimension is presented in the following table:

No	Institutional Dimonsion	Indicator					
190.	no. Institutional Dimension		Α	Ν	D	SD	
1	1 Seawater quality around the TUKS area remains well-maintained and unpolluted		28	10	14	17	
2	2 Fishermen still have easy access to fishing grounds		24	27	14	4	
3	TUKS operations do not disturb marine ecosystems in the fishermen's area	7	24	29	17	0	
4	4 The existence of TUKS does not cause damage to the coastal environment		21	15	29	5	
5	5 TUKS environmental management efforts consider marine ecosystem sustainability		19	24	23	2	
Total		39	116	105	97	28	
	Score Total	195	464	315	194	28	
	∑Score		1,196				
	Percentage (%)			13% (Agr	ree)		

-	-	
Table 5. The Impact of TUK	Operations on Communit	ty Welfare (Institutional Dimension)

The table above illustrates the institutional impact of the operations of Private Port Terminals (TUKS) on community welfare. The study evaluated five key indicators: seawater quality, fishermen's access to fishing areas, disruption to marine ecosystems, coastal environmental damage, and the sustainability of marine ecosystems. Respondents rated each indicator based on their level of agreement, categorized as Strongly Agree (SS), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

The first indicator, "Seawater quality around the TUKS area remains well-maintained and unpolluted," shows that most respondents agreed (28), although 14 disagreed and 17 strongly disagreed. Ten respondents were neutral. This indicates a mixed perception among the community, though the majority leaned toward a positive view.

In the second indicator, *"Fishermen still have easy access to fishing grounds,"* the majority agreed (24) or strongly agreed (8), though 27 were neutral. Fourteen disagreed and four strongly disagreed. This indicates that fishermen's access is still considered adequately maintained, although some dissenting views remain.

For the third indicator, "*TUKS operations do not disturb marine ecosystems in the fishermen's area*," most respondents agreed (24) or strongly agreed (7), but 29 were neutral and 17 disagreed. These findings suggest a generally positive perception, though some skepticism persists.

The fourth and fifth indicators—*coastal environmental damage* and *marine ecosystem sustainability*—revealed more diverse responses. Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that TUKS does not damage the coastal environment (21 and 7, respectively), although 29 respondents disagreed. Similarly, for sustainability, 19 agreed and 9 strongly agreed, but 23 still disagreed. These results show that while there is institutional trust and optimism, environmental concerns remain a significant issue among the community.

The results of the institutional dimension analysis suggest a generally favorable perception of TUKS operations in terms of governance and environmental responsibility, though not without reservations. Indicators such as seawater quality and access to fishing grounds received mostly positive responses, reflecting a certain level of public trust in institutional mechanisms surrounding TUKS operations. This is consistent with findings by Xin et al. (2022), who argue that transparent institutional practices and stakeholder engagement in maritime infrastructure projects are critical to building public trust and acceptance. However, the data also reveal that a substantial number of respondents remain neutral or disagree—especially in areas concerning marine ecosystem protection—indicating ongoing concerns about enforcement and accountability.

Furthermore, the variation in community responses suggests the presence of institutional asymmetries where regulatory frameworks exist but are unevenly implemented or perceived. Nursey-Bray et al. (2017) emphasize the importance of participatory governance models in coastal infrastructure projects to close the gap between policy and practice. When local communities perceive that their interests are considered in environmental oversight and spatial access, institutional legitimacy tends to increase. Similarly, Pérez-López et al. (2021) highlight that sustainability in port governance is best achieved when ecological goals are integrated into longterm planning and when community feedback informs adaptive management. The present study's findings highlight the need for more inclusive, transparent, and responsive institutional mechanisms to address lingering concerns—particularly regarding environmental risks that continue to affect coastal livelihoods.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that the operations of Private Port Terminals (TUKS) in Kendari City have had varying impacts on community welfare across different dimensions. While some aspects show promising contributions, others still require substantial improvement. The conclusions for each dimension are summarized as follows:

- 1. TUKS operations have not yet produced significant social impacts on local fishing communities in Kendari. Most respondents remained neutral regarding access to education, healthcare, safety, and participation in decision-making, indicating the need for more inclusive engagement and improved corporate social responsibility initiatives.
- 2. The economic benefits of TUKS are perceived as limited, despite some potential in job creation. Mixed responses regarding income, price stability, and market access highlight the need for more inclusive economic strategies and community-based empowerment to ensure equitable distribution of benefits.
- 3. TUKS has yet to demonstrate optimal performance in protecting marine and coastal environments. Negative perceptions of water pollution and ecosystem degradation reflect the community's concerns and call for stronger environmental impact management and public participation in monitoring.
- 4. Public perception of institutional aspects of TUKS is generally positive, particularly in terms of accessibility and governance. However, remaining concerns around sustainability suggest the need for more transparent, adaptive, and community-driven governance mechanisms.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. The company should enhance community engagement through CSR programs focused on education, health, and local economic development. Environmental management must be strengthened with transparent monitoring and community involvement. An inclusive economic ecosystem that prioritizes local labor and supports small enterprises should be developed, alongside institutional transparency to ensure accountability and public trust.
- 2. Future studies are encouraged to expand the geographical scope, apply mixed-method approaches, and conduct comparative and longitudinal analyses. An interdisciplinary and participatory research approach is also essential to generate deeper insights and more impactful policy recommendations.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- [1] Arikunto, S. (1997). Prosedur Penelitian Dengan Suatu Pendekatan Praktek. *Jakarta: Rineka Cipta*.
- [2] Asiaei, K., Jusoh, R., Barani, O., & Asiaei, A. (2022). How does green intellectual capital boost performance? The mediating role of environmental performance measurement systems. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *31*(4), 1587–1606. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2971
- Bebbington, A., Abdulai, A.-G., Humphreys Bebbington, D., Hinfelaar, M., & Sanborn, C. (2018). *Governing Extractive Industries*. Oxford University PressOxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198820932.001.0001
- [4] Bhuyan, M. S., Islam, M. N., Ali, M. M., Rashed-Un-Nabi, M., Alam, M. W., Das, M., Roy, R., Das, M. K., Mojumder, I. A., & Mustary, S. (2021). Blue economy prospect, opportunities, challenges, risks, and sustainable development pathways in Bangladesh. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1001892/v1
- [5] Bustillo-Castillejo, M. C., Pérez-Morote, R., & González-Moreno, Á. (2023). Corporate Social Responsibility and Community Legitimacy: Colombian Caribbean Insights. *Sustainability*, 15(18), 13659. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813659
- [6] Doughan, Y. A. R. (2020). Factors of production, economic growth, and sustainable development. In Decent Work and Economic Growth (pp. 427–439). Springer. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95867-5_121
- [7] Elpisah, E., Suarlin, S., & Yahya, M. (2021). Klassen Typology and Williamson Index to Measure Macroeconomics in South Sulawesi Province. *Golden Ratio of Social Science and Education*, 1(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.52970/grsse.v1i1.109
- [8] Fabinyi, M., Belton, B., Dressler, W. H., Knudsen, M., Adhuri, D. S., Aziz, A. A., Akber, M. A., Kittitornkool, J., Kongkaew, C., & Marschke, M. (2022). Coastal transitions: Small-scale fisheries, livelihoods, and maritime zone developments in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 91, 184–194. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.02.006

- [9] Fordham, A. E., & Robinson, G. M. (2019). Identifying the social values driving corporate social responsibility. *Sustainability Science*, 14, 1409–1424. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00720-w
- [10] Forgione, G., Izzo, F., Mercurio, M., Cicchella, D., Dini, L., Giancane, G., & Paolucci, M. (2023). Microplastics pollution in freshwater fishes in the South of Italy: Characterization, distribution, and correlation with environmental pollutants. *Science of The Total Environment*, 864, 161032. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.161032
- [11] Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 66, 101889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101889
- [12] Gissi, F., Stauber, J. L., Binet, M. T., Golding, L. A., Adams, M. S., Schlekat, C. E., Garman, E. R., & Jolley, D. F. (2016). A review of nickel toxicity to marine and estuarine tropical biota with particular reference to the South East Asian and Melanesian region. *Environmental Pollution*, 218, 1308–1323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.08.089
- [13] Haralambides, H. (2017). Globalization, public sector reform, and the role of ports in international supply chains. In *Maritime Economics & Logistics* (Vol. 19, pp. 1–51). Springer. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1057/s41278-017-0068-6
- [14] Ilyashenko, V. V. (2020). Financial and economic aspects of corporate social responsibility. SHS Web of Conferences, 89, 07002. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20208907002
- [15] Irmadhiany, M., Nikijuluw, V., Putra, K. S., Prasetia, R., Burhanuddin, Wibisono, E., Hakim, A., Tomasow, J., & Armanto, T. (2024). Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) with a Reference on Protection-production Approach: An Initial Lesson of TWP East Bintan, Kepulauan Riau Province. *BIO Web of Conferences*, 92, 01025. https://doi.org/10.1051/bioconf/20249201025
- [16] Kapologwe, N. A., Meara, J. G., Kengia, J. T., Sonda, Y., Gwajima, D., Alidina, S., & Kalolo, A. (2020). Development and upgrading of public primary healthcare facilities with essential surgical services infrastructure: a strategy towards achieving universal health coverage in Tanzania. *BMC Health Services Research*, 20(1), 218. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-5057-2
- [17] Kraus, S., Rehman, S. U., & García, F. J. S. (2020). Corporate social responsibility and environmental performance: The mediating role of environmental strategy and green innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 160, 120262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120262
- [18] McDonald, H., Hoffman, H., Ressurreição, A., Röschel, L., Gerdes, H., Lago, M., Boteler, B., McFarland, K., & Teixeira, H. (2020). Ecosystem-Based Management for More Effective and Equitable Marine Protected Areas: A Case Study on the Faial-Pico Channel Marine Protected Area, Azores. In *Ecosystem-Based Management, Ecosystem Services and Aquatic Biodiversity* (pp. 499–515). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45843-0_25
- [19] Nursey-Bray, M., Nicholls, R. J., Vince, J., Day, S., & Harvey, N. (2017). Public participation, coastal management and climate change adaptation. In *Marine and Coastal Resource Management* (pp. 223–239). Routledge.
- [20] Rela, I. Z., Awang, A. H., Ramli, Z., Md Sum, S., & Meisanti, M. (2020). Effects of environmental corporate social responsibility on environmental <scp>well-being</scp> perception and the mediation role of community resilience. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(5), 2176– 2187. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1956
- [21] Rodgers, K. S., Dona, A. R., Stender, Y. O., Tsang, A. O., Han, J. H. J., Weible, R. M., Prouty, N., Storlazzi, C., & Graham, A. T. (2021). Rebounds, regresses, and recovery: A 15-year study of the coral reef community at Pila 'a, Kaua 'i after decades of natural and anthropogenic stress events. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 171, 112306. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.112306
- [22] Siregar, B. (2019). Direct and indirect effects of investment on community welfare. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, *16*(3), 206–216. https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.16(3).2019.19
- [23] Siswanto, A., & Hadwidjojo, D. (2020). The Effect of Forest Institution Connectedness, Incentive Participation Program, and Social Capital on Public Participation and Welfare as Mediators of Forest Management in Baluran National Park. In *Protected Areas, National Parks and Sustainable Future*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.84674
- [24] Sobieralski, J. B., & Hubbard, S. M. (2023). Turbulent skies ahead? Pandemic related workforce issues in air transportation. *Transport Policy*, 130, 84–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2022.11.005
- [25] Taufiqurrahman, E., Prayitno, H. B., Ibrahim, P. S., Ratnawati, H. I., & Maslukah, L. (2023). Marine Protected Area management under the impacts of climate change and increased human activities in marine ecosystems: A review for Anambas Islands MPA. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1163(1), 012022. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1163/1/012022

- [26] Toussaint, E. C. (2019). Dismantling the Master's House: Toward a Justice-Based Theory of Community Economic Development. U. Mich. JL Reform, 53, 337.
- [27] Varese, E., Marigo, D. S., & Lombardi, M. (2020). Dry Port: A Review on Concept, Classification, Functionalities and Technological Processes. Logistics, 4(4), 29. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/logistics4040029
- [28] Wu, Y., Zhou, J., Zhou, X., Hu, Z., Cai, Q., Yang, S., & Lu, Q. (2023). Site selection of crop straw cogeneration project under intuitionistic fuzzy environment: A four-stage decision framework from the perspective of circular economy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 395, 136431.
- [29] Xin, X., Liu, M., Wang, X., Chen, H., & Chen, K. (2022). Investment strategy for blockchain technology in a shipping supply chain. Ocean & Coastal Management, 226, 106263. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2022.106263
- [30] Yao, K. A. F., Yao, B. K., Belcourt, O., Salze, D., Lasm, T., Lopez-Ferber, M., & Junqua, G. (2020). Mining Impacts Assessment Using the LCA Methodology: Case Study of Afema Gold Mine in Ivory Coast. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 17(2), 465–479. https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4336