

From Preservation to Advancement: Reconfiguring the Meaning of Culture in Indonesian Policy, 2017-2022

Septiawan Ardiputra
Universitas Sulawesi Barat, Indonesia
septiawan.ardiputra@unsulbar.ac.id

INFO ARTICLE	ABSTRACT
<i>Article History:</i> Accepted: June 14, 2023 Revised: August 29, 2023 Approved: October 18, 2023 Available Online: November 1, 2023 <i>Keywords:</i> <i>Adaptive preservation</i> <i>Advancement of Culture</i> <i>Cultural governance</i> <i>Cultural policy</i> <i>Policy reconfiguration</i>	Indonesian cultural policy underwent a significant transformation following the enactment of Law No. 5 of 2017 on the Advancement of Culture. This study examines how cultural meaning was reconfigured in national policy between 2017 and 2022. Using qualitative document analysis, seven national policy documents were analyzed through deductive-inductive coding, within-document analysis, cross-document comparison, and thematic development. The findings reveal five major patterns: preservation is increasingly framed as adaptive; culture is institutionalized through data and planning; its functions expand toward development, welfare, and value creation; society is increasingly positioned as an active actor while the state assumes a facilitating role; and cultural policy increasingly addresses identity, inclusion, ecology, and international engagement. The study concludes that the Advancement of Culture does not replace preservation but reconfigures it as one function within a broader policy architecture that is more adaptive, development-oriented, institutionalized, and participatory.

©2023, Septiawan Ardiputra
This is an open access article under CC BY-SA license



1. Introduction

Cultural policy is concerned not only with the protection of heritage but also with how the state defines the position and functions of culture within social life and development. The cultural policy literature shows that culture is increasingly situated in relation to sustainability, well-being, cultural rights, and development, such that policy is no longer confined solely to protecting cultural objects or practices (Balta Portoles & Dragićević Šešić, 2017; Duxbury et al., 2017; Throsby, 2017). This expansion positions culture as possessing intrinsic value as well as social, economic, and public value. However, the broadening of these functions also generates a fundamental tension: policy must sustain the continuity of cultural values and identities without freezing them into static forms, while simultaneously creating space for development and utilization without reducing culture to merely an instrument or commodity of development (Isar, 2017).

In this study, culture is understood not as a fixed collection of heritage objects or traditions, but as a dynamic field of values, practices, expressions, knowledge, actors, and cultural ecosystems whose meanings and functions are continuously negotiated and shaped through policy. Cultural policy, accordingly, refers to the institutional frameworks, policy instruments, strategies, and governance arrangements through which the state defines, supports, regulates, and mobilizes culture for public purposes. This understanding allows cultural policy to be

examined not merely in terms of what it protects, but also in terms of how it assigns changing meanings, functions, and relationships to culture within broader processes of governance and development.

In the Indonesian context, a significant shift occurred following the enactment of Law No. 5 of 2017 on the Advancement of Culture (Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 2017 tentang Pemajuan Kebudayaan, UU No. 5 Tahun 2017). The Law brings Protection, Development, Utilization, and Fostering within a unified architecture of the Advancement of Culture, while simultaneously broadening policy objectives toward welfare, development, and greater community participation (UU No. 5 Tahun 2017). This framework was subsequently developed through the formulation of the Cultural Strategy under Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture (Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Permendikbud) No. 46 of 2018 and Presidential Regulation (Peraturan Presiden, Perpres) No. 114 of 2022, the integration of culture into national development planning through Perpres No. 18 of 2020, and the strengthening of data systems and increasingly detailed provisions governing protection, development, utilization, and fostering through Government Regulation (Peraturan Pemerintah, PP) No. 87 of 2021. These developments indicate that the 2017-2022 period involved more than the addition of policy instruments, it also generated a series of changes in how culture was defined, directed, and positioned within public governance. This period therefore provides an important basis for tracing the longitudinal reconfiguration of cultural meaning.

This reconfiguration cannot be understood as a linear shift from preservation to utilization or as the replacement of preservation by the Advancement of Culture. The National Medium-Term Development Plan (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional, RPJMN) 2020-2024 continues to combine the advancement and preservation of culture, while simultaneously linking the development and utilization of cultural resources to the strengthening of national character and identity, welfare, cultural diplomacy, and the governance of cultural development (Perpres No. 18 of 2020). The 2021 implementing regulation further allows cultural maintenance to be carried out through the use of Objects of Cultural Advancement (Objek Pemajuan Kebudayaan, OPK) in everyday life and through modifications intended to maintain their relevance to societal needs (PP No. 87 of 2021). In 2022, the Cultural Strategy further emphasized that the continuity of tradition does not imply immutability, as enduring cultural practices are themselves the result of adaptation to changing circumstances and innovations introduced by previous generations (Perpres No. 114 of 2022). This pattern points to a more complex analytical issue: how preservation is maintained while simultaneously being repositioned within the broader paradigm of the Advancement of Culture.

Several studies have examined specific dimensions of changes in Indonesian cultural policy, but they have tended to focus on discrete aspects. The legal protection of traditional cultural knowledge and expressions has been examined in relation to improving community welfare (Atsar, 2017). The relationship between cultural development and human development has also been analyzed using quantitative indicators (Zuriatina, 2020). Other studies have examined the Integrated Cultural Data System as an instrument for protecting traditional cultural expressions (Sari & Mawardah, 2021), and have situated traditional cultural expressions within the framework of communal intellectual property protection (Kusuma & Roisah, 2022). International scholarship has likewise addressed shifts in the paradigm of participation in cultural policy (Bonet & Négrier, 2018), community participation in cultural heritage management (Li et al., 2019), and the utilization of cultural heritage for sustainable development (Giliberto & Labadi, 2021). However, few studies have longitudinally traced how the sequence of post-2017 national policies has cumulatively reconstructed the relationships among preservation, development, governance, and the role of society. Consequently, it remains

unclear whether the Advancement of Culture represents a replacement of the preservation paradigm or, instead, its reconfiguration within a broader policy architecture.

Based on this gap, this study aims to analyze the reconfiguration of cultural meaning in Indonesian policy between 2017 and 2022 through a longitudinal reading of seven national documents that shaped and articulated the policy framework of the Advancement of Culture. It examines how culture is constructed across these documents, how the Advancement of Culture reconfigures the position of preservation through development, utilization, and development-related functions, and how these changes reshape the relationships among the state, society, and culture within public governance. Using qualitative document analysis and cross-document comparison, the study focuses on shifts in policy framing and policy rationalities rather than on the effectiveness of implementation. In this study, policy reconfiguration refers to a process in which existing policy functions are not eliminated but are repositioned, recombined, and assigned new relationships and purposes within a broader policy architecture. Reconfiguration therefore differs from policy replacement, it emphasizes continuity alongside changes in the relative position, function, and relationship of policy elements. Accordingly, this study argues that the Advancement of Culture does not replace preservation but reconfigures it as one function within a broader policy architecture that is more adaptive, development-oriented, institutionalized, and participatory.

2. Method

This study employs a qualitative approach using qualitative document analysis (QDA) to examine the reconfiguration of cultural meaning in Indonesian policy between 2017 and 2022. QDA allows documents to be treated as data sources that can be systematically analyzed to identify meanings, patterns, and policy changes (Bowen, 2009). Policy document analysis also enables the construction of a corpus based on substantive and temporal boundaries that correspond to the research questions (Dalglish et al., 2020). The analysis was conducted longitudinally because the study focuses on continuity, expansion, and shifts in policy framing rather than on implementation effectiveness. The corpus comprises seven documents: UU No. 5 of 2017, Permendikbud No. 46 of 2018, the 2018 Indonesian Cultural Congress Book (Buku Kongres Kebudayaan Indonesia 2018, KKI), RPJMN 2020-2024, the Ministry of Education and Culture Strategic Plan 2020-2024 (Rencana Strategis Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2020-2024, Renstra Kemendikbud), PP No. 87 of 2021, and Perpres No. 114 of 2022. These documents represent the normative, strategic, development-planning, operationalization, and consolidation stages of the Advancement of Culture policy. The KKI 2018 Book is treated as a policy-discursive document rather than as a regulation with the same legal status as the other documents.

The documents were selected purposively based on four criteria: they were issued or in force between 2017 and 2022; were enacted by state institutions or formed part of the official process of national cultural policy formulation; had substantive relevance to the Advancement of Culture; and contained definitions, objectives, strategies, instruments, or directions for cultural governance. The units of analysis included statutory provisions, phrases, statements, objectives, strategies, and narratives that constructed the position and functions of culture. The analysis began with sensitizing categories covering preservation and protection, development and adaptation, utilization, culture and development, state-society relations, and policy institutionalization. These categories were translated into initial codes, including preservation, protection, development, adaptation, innovation, utilization, welfare, state, society, and institutionalization. Coding followed a hybrid deductive-inductive approach: the initial

categories provided analytical orientation, while codes could be merged, separated, or further developed as new patterns emerged from the documents (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006).

The analysis proceeded through five stages: familiarization, initial coding, within-document analysis, cross-document comparison, and theme development. Theme development focused on identifying patterns of meaning across the data rather than merely grouping topics, in line with the principles of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2008). Each coded unit was documented together with its source, section or statutory provision, code, category, interpretation, and provisional theme in order to establish an audit trail. Credibility was strengthened through temporal and cross-document comparison, repeated verification of textual evidence, the identification of evidence that contradicted or diverged from dominant patterns, and the iterative refinement of codes and themes (Nowell et al., 2017). This procedure generated five final themes that explain the reconfiguration of cultural meaning during 2017-2022. Because the data consist of documents, the findings are interpreted as changes in policy framing, design, and rationalities rather than as evidence of implementation effectiveness.

3. Result and Discussion

Reconfiguring Preservation: Protection within a Framework of Adaptive Cultural Sustainability

The cross-document findings show that the Advancement of Culture does not eliminate preservation but instead situates it within a broader policy architecture. UU No. 5 of 2017 defines Protection as an effort to safeguard the sustainability of culture and positions it alongside Development, Utilization, and Fostering within a unified framework of the Advancement of Culture. Development is formulated as an effort to revitalize the cultural ecosystem, while Utilization links OPK to the objectives of strengthening character, cultural resilience, community welfare, and Indonesia's role in international relations (UU No. 5 of 2017, Articles 1 and 32). This structure indicates that preservation is not positioned merely as a stand-alone objective but as one of the functions supporting cultural sustainability within the framework of the Advancement of Culture. Accordingly, the pattern emerging since 2017 is more appropriately understood as a reconfiguration of preservation, namely, the positioning of protection alongside development, utilization, and fostering within a broader policy paradigm.

This reconfiguration became increasingly explicit during 2021-2022. PP No. 87 of 2021 stipulates that maintenance may be carried out through the everyday use of OPK, modifications intended to maintain their relevance to societal needs, the safeguarding of cultural diversity, and the revitalization of cultural ecosystems (PP No. 87 of 2021, Articles 47-49). The 2022 Cultural Strategy further reinforces this orientation by challenging the assumption that traditional practices must be preserved without change. The document emphasizes that cultural practices that have endured to the present are themselves shaped through adaptation to changing circumstances and innovation across generations (Perpres No. 114 of 2022). Cultural continuity, therefore, is not constructed as the reproduction of forms identical to those of the past, but as the capacity to sustain cultural values and significance through use, transmission, adaptation, and renewal. These findings demonstrate a broadening of the preservation orientation, from safeguarding cultural objects toward sustaining cultural practices, values, and ecosystems.

This study conceptualizes adaptive cultural preservation as an approach to cultural continuity in which cultural values and identities are sustained not by maintaining cultural forms unchanged, but by allowing their continued use, adaptation, innovation, transmission, and transformation. This concept intersects with the living heritage approach, which regards continuity and communities' active relationships with heritage as integral to conservation (Poulios, 2013). The 2003 Convention of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and

Cultural Organization (Organisasi Pendidikan, Ilmu Pengetahuan, dan Kebudayaan Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa, UNESCO) similarly views intangible cultural heritage as continuously recreated by communities in response to their environment, their interaction with nature, and their history (UNESCO, 2003), while research on living cultural heritage suggests that heritage continuity may involve adaptive capacities and community resilience in the face of change (Bui et al., 2020). The Indonesian case extends this perspective to the level of national policy, adaptation emerges not merely as a social practice but is also institutionalized through the regulatory framework of the Advancement of Culture. Adaptive cultural preservation therefore represents continuity through change rather than continuity through freezing culture in fixed forms.

Making Culture an Object of Governance: Strategic Institutionalization and Datafication

Cross-document analysis shows that the Advancement of Culture has gradually established mechanisms through which culture becomes increasingly knowable, mappable, plannable, and measurable as a policy domain. Permendikbud No. 46 of 2018 regulates the formulation of the Cultural Strategy through data consolidation and processing, analysis of cultural conditions and challenges, and the formulation of a 20-year vision, strategic issues, and key methods for advancing culture. This process of institutionalization was further strengthened by PP No. 87 of 2021, which elaborates the Integrated Cultural Data System (Sistem Pendataan Kebudayaan Terpadu) to produce cultural data that are accurate, effective, efficient, accessible, representative, and integrated. This pattern indicates that culture is increasingly constructed as an administratively legible policy domain, enabling knowledge about cultural objects, actors, resources, and challenges to serve as a basis for planning and decision-making.

This process developed cumulatively throughout 2017-2022. UU No. 5 of 2017 established a hierarchical policy architecture through the Regional Cultural Policy Framework (Pokok Pikiran Kebudayaan Daerah, PPKD), the Cultural Strategy, the Master Plan for the Advancement of Culture (Rencana Induk Pemajuan Kebudayaan, RIPK), and the Integrated Cultural Data System. In 2018, this architecture was further equipped with procedures for data processing and a long-term strategic orientation, while by 2020 culture was increasingly translated into programs, performance indicators, targets, and funding frameworks (Permendikbud No. 46 of 2018; Permendikbud No. 22 of 2020). PP No. 87 of 2021 subsequently linked the RIPK to the Long-Term Development Plan (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang, RPJP) and the Medium-Term Development Plan (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah, RPJM), as well as to the allocation of ministerial and agency budgets, while also standardizing data, metadata, interoperability, and access. By 2022, the data system was increasingly constructed as an open and credible infrastructure that is accessible to the public and continuously updated based on input from practitioners and users (Perpres No. 114 of 2022).

This study conceptualizes the datafication of culture as the process through which the complexity of cultural life is rendered administratively legible by translating cultural practices, actors, resources, and problems into data, categories, indicators, targets, planning documents, and budgetary instruments. The term datafication of culture is used here as an analytical concept rather than as an official term employed in policy documents. The development of cultural policy indicators is closely associated with demands for efficiency, transparency, and accountability (Karttunen, 2012), while practices of measurement and calculation also shape how value, performance, success, and failure in cultural policy are defined (Donovan & O'Brien, 2016). However, cultural indicators are inherently contextual, and overly uniform standardization may reduce the capacity of policy to respond to diverse cultural conditions (Johanson et al., 2014). This creates a tension between administrative legibility and cultural

complexity: the more culture is rendered amenable to planning and measurement, the greater the risk that its complexity will be reduced to administrative categories.

Expanding the Functions of Culture in Development: Heritage, Capital, Welfare, and Value Creation

Cross-document analysis shows that the Advancement of Culture expands the functions of culture without abandoning its preservation dimension. UU No. 5 of 2017 links the utilization of OPK to the strengthening of character, cultural resilience, community welfare, and Indonesia's enhanced role in international relations (UU No. 5 of 2017). In 2018, the KKI positioned culture as the "upstream of development" and promoted the mainstreaming of culture across various areas of development (Directorate General of Culture, 2018). This orientation became more institutionalized in the RPJMN 2020-2024 through the mainstreaming of social and cultural capital, encompassing the internalization of values and the mobilization of cultural resources to support the overall development process (Perpres No. 18 of 2020). Culture is therefore constructed not only as heritage that must be safeguarded but also as a form of development capital with social, economic, and strategic functions.

This expansion became more concrete during 2021-2022. PP No. 87 of 2021 permits OPK to be developed into products aimed at enhancing welfare, supported through research and development assistance, access to financing, incentive policies, and technical guidance or training, while still requiring the preservation of cultural values and wisdom (PP No. 87 of 2021). The 2022 Cultural Strategy subsequently criticized a development paradigm that treats culture as an expenditure burden rather than as a source of developmental strength. The document promotes long-term investment and explicitly prioritizes *daya budi* (value creation) over *budi daya* (value extraction) (Perpres No. 114 of 2022). At the same time, the economic utilization of culture is placed within normative boundaries that emphasize equitable benefit-sharing, the sustainability of cultural ecosystems, and adherence to preservation principles.

Analytically, this pattern is conceptualized as the developmental framing of culture, referring to the increasingly prominent framing of culture in terms of its contribution to development objectives without entirely relinquishing the cultural values embedded within it. The term is used here as an analytical concept rather than as official terminology employed in the policy documents. The concept of cultural capital suggests that cultural assets possess cultural value while also generating streams of economic benefits, making it relevant to discussions of investment, sustainability, and development (Throsby, 1999). Cultural policy can also contribute to sustainable development through multiple, intersecting pathways (Duxbury et al., 2017). However, critiques of instrumental cultural policy highlight the problems that arise when cultural value is justified primarily in terms of external socioeconomic benefits (Belfiore, 2010). This study conceptualizes productive utilization with cultural safeguards as the use of cultural resources for welfare, economic, and developmental purposes while maintaining normative boundaries that protect cultural values, ensure equitable benefit-sharing, and sustain cultural ecosystems. It therefore differs from unrestricted commercialization, in which economic value becomes the predominant rationale for cultural utilization.

Reconfiguring Cultural Governance: Society as Actor, the State as Facilitator

Cross-document analysis shows that the Advancement of Culture reconfigures the positions of society and the state within cultural governance. UU No. 5 of 2017 grants every person the right to participate in the Advancement of Culture and assigns the government the responsibility of encouraging active societal participation and community initiatives (UU No. 5 of 2017). This orientation was articulated more explicitly in the KKI 2018, which rejected two extremes: the state as the "owner" of culture and the complete absence of the state. As a middle ground, the state was positioned as a "guide for society," assisting communities in formulating their own

cultural strategies (Directorate General of Culture, 2018). The formulation of the Cultural Strategy was likewise constructed as a participatory process involving government representatives, experts, cultural practitioners, and regional representatives (Directorate General of Culture, 2018). Society is therefore increasingly positioned not merely as a recipient of policy but as an active actor in cultural governance.

This orientation became increasingly institutionalized during 2020-2022. The Ministry of Education and Culture Strategic Plan 2020-2024 (Rencana Strategis Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2020-2024, Renstra Kemendikbud) explicitly promotes the strengthening of community-led initiatives to preserve and advance culture, thereby enabling the government to assume a facilitating role (Permendikbud No. 22 of 2020). PP No. 87 of 2021 subsequently provides an operational basis by stipulating that every person may actively participate in the development of OPK, either independently or in collaboration with the government (PP No. 87 of 2021). In 2022, the Cultural Strategy identified the failure to position society as the “front line of the Advancement of Culture” as a policy problem and framed the government as a facilitator that encourages the participation of diverse societal actors (Perpres No. 114 of 2022). This pattern indicates a strengthening of societal agency within a facilitative state framework, rather than a transfer of the state’s entire responsibility for culture to society.

These findings intersect with the literature on participatory cultural governance. In the context of Indonesian public policy, societal engagement through the formation of public discourse can also influence policy processes, although its effects are not uniform across issues and cases (Prawira, Ardiputra, et al., 2022). Participation in cultural policy refers not only to involvement in cultural activities but also to engagement in policy-making processes, nevertheless, the institutionalization of participation may still constrain who possesses the resources and access required to participate (Marx, 2019). Likewise, the rhetoric of increased participation does not necessarily lead to a broader distribution of power when decision-making processes remain shaped by the interests and voices of particular groups (Jancovich, 2017). The Indonesian findings should therefore be interpreted as a reconfiguration of governance design rather than as empirical evidence that power has shifted to society. An important tension remains: even as society is increasingly positioned as a central actor, the state continues to strengthen regulation, planning, data systems, funding, and cultural infrastructure. Thus, the transformation does not signify a withdrawal of the state but rather a reconfiguration of the mode of state intervention toward facilitation, empowerment, and the provision of conditions that enable societal agency.

Expanding the Public Objectives of Culture: Identity, Inclusion, Ecology, and International Engagement

Cross-document analysis shows that, since 2017, the Advancement of Culture has been positioned within a spectrum of public objectives extending beyond preservation alone. UU No. 5 of 2017 links the Advancement of Culture to the development of noble cultural values, diversity, national identity and unity, education, the nation’s image, civil society, welfare, the preservation of cultural heritage, and Indonesia’s influence on the development of world civilization (UU No. 5 of 2017). This orientation became increasingly connected to the development agenda in the RPJMN 2020-2024, which links the development and utilization of cultural resources to the strengthening of national character and identity, welfare, social cohesion, and Indonesia’s influence on the development of world civilization (Perpres No. 18 of 2020). Culture is therefore constructed as a cross-sectoral domain of public policy concerned not only with cultural transmission, but also with identity, social life, welfare, development, and Indonesia’s position in the international arena.

This spectrum of objectives is articulated more comprehensively in the 2022 Cultural Strategy. The document identifies discrimination and violations of freedom of expression and assembly as issues within the Advancement of Culture, including those affecting minority groups, Indigenous communities, custodians of tradition, and other vulnerable groups (Perpres No. 114 of 2022). Its seven strategic methods subsequently connect culture with diversity of expression and inclusion, the protection and development of traditions, Indonesia's position in the international arena, welfare, biodiversity and ecosystems, institutional and budgetary reform, and the government's role as a facilitator (Perpres No. 114 of 2022). The international dimension, already present since 2017, is also articulated more explicitly through the aspiration to influence the global order by mobilizing cultural wealth and cultural strength as forms of capital (Perpres No. 114 of 2022). Thus, the Advancement of Culture increasingly integrates identity, cultural rights, social inclusion, ecological sustainability, welfare, and international engagement within a single policy framework.

This expansion intersects with the literature linking cultural policy to cultural rights and sustainable development. The relationship between cultural rights and sustainable development has important implications for policy design, although translating these principles into policy capacities and practices is not always straightforward (Balta Portoles & Dragićević Šešić, 2017). Cultural policy can also support cultural practices and rights while contributing to sustainability through multiple pathways, including the development of ecological citizenship (Duxbury et al., 2017). At the international level, the literature suggests that cultural diplomacy cannot be understood solely through a narrow conception of national interest; rather, it increasingly unfolds through transnational cultural relations involving a diverse range of actors (Ang et al., 2015). The Indonesian findings therefore point to a cross-sectoral expansion of cultural policy objectives, while simultaneously highlighting the need to balance national identity, cultural rights, inclusion, development, ecological sustainability, and international strategic interests.

4. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the transformation of Indonesian cultural policy during 2017-2022 did not represent the replacement of preservation by the Advancement of Culture, but rather a reconfiguration of the position of preservation within a broader policy architecture. Protection remains a foundational principle of cultural sustainability, yet it is increasingly situated alongside development, utilization, fostering, planning, data collection, and societal participation. This reconfiguration produced five major patterns: preservation became increasingly adaptive; culture became more institutionalized and administratively legible through data and planning instruments; the functions of culture expanded toward development capital, welfare, and value creation; society was increasingly constructed as an active actor while the state assumed a facilitating role; and the public objectives of cultural policy broadened to encompass identity, inclusion, ecological sustainability, and international engagement. Accordingly, the Advancement of Culture reconfigures preservation from a relatively stand-alone objective into one function within a cultural policy paradigm that is more adaptive, developmental, institutionalized, and participatory.

These findings imply that the expansion of culture's functions must continue to balance productivity and protection, administrative measurability and cultural complexity, as well as state facilitation and societal agency. Cultural policy, therefore, should not be assessed solely in terms of its capacity to generate developmental benefits, but also in terms of its ability to preserve cultural values, sustain cultural ecosystems, uphold cultural rights, and maintain meaningful spaces for participation. Conceptually, this study interprets the Advancement of Culture as a process of reconfiguration rather than replacement, through adaptive cultural

preservation, the datafication of culture, and productive utilization with cultural safeguards. Because this study focuses on policy documents and policy rationalities, future research should examine how this reconfiguration is translated into implementation at the national and subnational levels, including how communities experience and negotiate the roles assigned to them in the practice of the Advancement of Culture.

5. References

- Ang, I., Isar, Y. R., & Mar, P. (2015). Cultural diplomacy: beyond the national interest? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(4), 365–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1042474>
- Atsar, A. (2017). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pengetahuan Dan Ekspresi Budaya Tradisional Untuk Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Ditinjau Dari Undang-Undang No. 5 Tahun 2017 Tentang Pemajuan Kebudayaan Dan Undang-Undang No. 28 Tahun 2014 Tentang Hak Cipta. *Law Reform*, 13(2), 284–299. <https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v13i2.16162>
- Balta Portoles, J., & Dragićević Šešić, M. (2017). Cultural rights and their contribution to sustainable development: Implications for cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(2), 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1280787>
- Belfiore, E. (2010). Art as a means of alleviating social exclusion: Does it really work? A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8(1), 91–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/102866302900324658>
- Bonet, L., & Négrier, E. (2018). The participative turn in cultural policy: Paradigms, models, contexts. *Poetics*, 66, 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.02.006>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2008). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Bui, H. T., Jones, T. E., Weaver, D. B., & Le, A. (2020). The adaptive resilience of living cultural heritage in a tourism destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(7), 1022–1040. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1717503>
- DalGLISH, S. L., Khalid, H., & McMahon, S. A. (2020). Document analysis in health policy research: the READ approach. *Health Policy and Planning*, 35(10), 1424–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czaa064>
- Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2018). Kongres Kebudayaan Indonesia 2018: Berkepribadian dalam kebudayaan.
- Donovan, C., & O'Brien, D. (2016). Governing culture: Legislators, interpreters and accountants. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 37, 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2015.10.003>
- Duxbury, N., Kangas, A., & De Beukelaer, C. (2017). Cultural policies for sustainable development: Four strategic paths. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(2), 214–230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1280789>
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690600500107>

- Giliberto, F., & Labadi, S. (2021). Harnessing cultural heritage for sustainable development: an analysis of three internationally funded projects in MENA Countries. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 28(2), 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2021.1950026>
- Isar, Y. R. (2017). ‘Culture’, ‘sustainable development’ and cultural policy: a contrarian view. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(2), 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1280785>
- Jancovich, L. (2017). The participation myth. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(1), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2015.1027698>
- Johanson, K., Glow, H., & Kershaw, A. (2014). New modes of arts participation and the limits of cultural indicators for local government. *Poetics*, 43, 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2014.02.002>
- Karttunen, S. (2012). Cultural policy indicators: reflections on the role of official statisticians in the politics of data collection. *Cultural Trends*, 21(2), 133–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2012.674753>
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2018). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 46 Tahun 2018 tentang Pedoman Penyusunan Strategi Kebudayaan. Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2018 Nomor 1821.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (2020). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2020 tentang Rencana Strategis Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Tahun 2020–2024. Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2020 Nomor 555.
- Kusuma, P. H., & Roisah, K. (2022). Perlindungan Ekspresi Budaya Tradisional Dan Indikasi Geografis: Suatu Kekayaan Intelektual Dengan Kepemilikan Komunal. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, 4(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jphi.v4i1.107-120>
- Li, J., Krishnamurthy, S., Roders, A. P., & Van Wesemael, P. (2019). Community participation in cultural heritage management: A systematic literature review comparing Chinese and international practices. *Cities*, 96, 102476. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102476>
- Marx, L. (2019). Participation as policy in local cultural governance. *Cultural Trends*, 28(4), 294–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2019.1644786>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1609406917733847. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Poulios, I. (2013). Is every heritage site a ‘living’ one? Linking conservation to communities’ association with sites. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 2(2), 144–156. <https://doi.org/10.1179/175675011X13122044136550>
- Prawira, M. R., Ardiputra, S., & Hidayat, R. (2022). Analisis Dampak Wacana Publik Di Media Massa Dan Media Sosial Terhadap Kebijakan Publik (Sulawesi Barat). *MANDAR: Social Science Journal*, 1(1), 74–85. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31605/mssj.v1i1.1776>
- Republik Indonesia. (2017). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 5 Tahun 2017 tentang Pemajuan Kebudayaan.



- Republik Indonesia. (2020). Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 18 Tahun 2020 tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional Tahun 2020–2024. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2020 Nomor 10.
- Republik Indonesia. (2021). Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 87 Tahun 2021 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 2017 tentang Pemajuan Kebudayaan. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2021 Nomor 191, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 6713.
- Republik Indonesia. (2022). Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 114 Tahun 2022 tentang Strategi Kebudayaan. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2022 Nomor 183.
- Sari, N. K., & Mawardah, D. A. (2021). Sistem Pendataan Kebudayaan Terpadu Alternatif Perlindungan Hukum Ekspresi Budaya Tradisional. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 18(3), 405–418. <https://doi.org/10.54629/jli.v18i3.823>
- Throsby, D. (1999). Cultural capital. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 23(1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007543313370>
- Throsby, D. (2017). Culturally sustainable development: theoretical concept or practical policy instrument? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 23(2), 133–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2017.1280788>
- UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000132540>
- Zuriatina, I. (2020). Pengaruh pembangunan kebudayaan terhadap pembangunan manusia di Indonesia. *Temali: Jurnal Pembangunan Sosial*, 3(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jt.v3i1.6364>