

## Creative Economy & Community Cultural Development

**Monica E. Madyaningrum, M. Psych.**  
*Faculty of Psychology*  
*Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya*  
*Email: eviandaru@yahoo.com*

Creative economy is a recent buzzword in the Indonesian economic development. While many have asserted the potential contribution of creative economy for Indonesian economic development, challenges remain in putting the idea into practice. Collaboration between intellectuals, business and government is frequently mentioned as the key feature of developing creative economy (Departemen Perdagangan RI, 2008). Given such consideration, therefore, one of the challenges in putting the idea into practice is to develop a conceptual framework which will enable government sectors to create an encouraging atmosphere for the development of creative economy. Responding to this challenge, this paper aims to discuss the concept of community cultural development and how it can be used as a conceptual framework which may increase government's capacity, especially at local level, to contribute to the development of creative economy. There are three main parts in the paper. The first section describes a brief overview of the current development of creative economy in Indonesia. The next section describes the concept of community cultural development. Last, the paper discusses the possibility of implementing the idea in the Indonesian context.

**Keywords:** *creative economy, community cultural development.*

### Creative Economy in Indonesia

Creative economy is a recent buzzword in the Indonesian economic development. In fact, 2009 is inaugurated as the year of creative economy by the Indonesian government. Previously, the Indonesian Ministry of Trade has launched the blueprint of Creative Economy Development 2025 (Hermana, 2009; Yusuf, 2009). Also, it is mentioned in the Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry 2030 vision that creative economy is one of the Indonesian future economic strengths (Gobel, 2008). Most of public discourses on the matter assert that creative economy is a promising strategy for solving Indonesian economic challenges, both in a short term and long term. Creative economy is seen as having potential to increase Indonesian economic growth especially following the current global financial crisis. It is also counted as an answer to other on going socio-economic problems in Indonesia such as high rate of unemployment, poverty and the poor quality of Indonesian industrial competitiveness (Departemen Perdagangan RI, 2008).

The significance of creative economy for Indonesian economic development is reflected in its contribution to the Indonesian Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Between 2002 – 2006, its average contribution is 6.3 percent which is equal to 104.6 billion Indonesian Rupiah. The export contribution of creative industries reaches 81.4 billion Indonesian Rupiah which makes up 9.13 percent of the national total export. In term of creating job opportunity, it is reported that the industry has been involving 5.4 million workers (Oetama, 2008). The economic contribution of creative industries is even higher than the contributions of electricity, natural gas and water (Rusliana, 2009).

Creative economy is valued as a viable source for developing sustainable economy as it is based on renewable energy that is local communities' creativity. That is why, besides developing business, creative economy is also valued as a way to develop nation's identity and character (Oetama, 2008). Creative economy which is developed based on cultural industries is seen as an opportunity for a multicultural country like Indonesia to explore its cultural diversity as one the nation strengths. Many argues that cultural diversity may provide enormous energy for developing creative and distinct communities (Gobel, 2008; Oetama, 2008; Rusliana, 2009)

Indonesia's enthusiasm on creative economy is part of a global economic trend which is marked by the shift of developed countries like England, United States, and Australia from their orientation toward industrial economy to creative economy (Coy, 2000). In Asia, countries like Singapore, Hongkong, Taiwan, China and India are the

leading countries in the development of creative economy. Realizing the power of creative economy, those leading countries has been developing more integrative national policies targeted for advancing their cultural industries. Singapore for example, since 1990, has set up a Creative Services Strategic Business Unit, which later changed into the Creative Business Programme which is aimed to develop Singapore as a centre of excellence for the various creative industries (Kong, Gibson, May Khoo, & Semple, 2006; Yue, 2006). The significance of creative economy for the development of those countries' national economy is also reflected in the contribution that the industry has made for their national GDP. In Singapore, the contribution is 2.8 percent. In fact, in England the contribution is 7.9 percent (Departemen Perdagangan RI, 2008). It is this global trend which affirms Indonesian government's priority on the role of creative economy.

Creative economy is economic practices which are developed based on industries made up by individuals or groups' which emphasize the use creativity, skills and talent to create business competitiveness through the production and distribution of creative ideas (Gobel, 2008; Supratikno, 2008; Yusuf, 2008). As creativity becomes the main keyword in this area therefore, the development of creative economy often requires new approaches and strategies which push the actors (intellectual – business – government) to explore alternative ways in doing business. One such alternative is a change in the way a society should place arts and cultures in their socio-economic map. Nowadays, most society tends to place art and culture as their least prioritized areas. However in the era of creative economy such view is challenged. Today, more and more societies emphasize the essential role of developing arts and cultures to advance their nation's competitiveness. As Eger (2006) put it:

“Cities of the future no doubt will be “creative communities” in the sense that they recognize art and culture as vital, not only to region's liveability, but also to preparedness of its workforce. Future cities will understand that art-infused education is critical to producing the next generation of leaders and workers for the knowledge economy...” (p. 20)

It is therefore this paper aims to discuss specifically about the role of arts and cultures in the development of creative economy. The term 'creative' in the concept of creative economy is not narrowly associated only with what so called 'arts and cultures'. However, this paper chooses to focus its discussion on this area as arts and cultures are one of this country's greatest assets in term of developing creative economy.

### **Community Cultural Development (CCD) and Creative Economy**

It is frequently pointed in many articles about creative economy that Indonesian cultural diversity is one of the potential resources for the development of creative economy. Therefore, having a well-planned cultural development strategy is an essential component need to be taken in order to create an encouraging atmosphere for the development of creative economy. It is here that the paper sees the relevance of discussing the concept of community cultural development (CCD). Other countries' experience shows that CCD could be a viable conceptual orientation to develop a community's cultural life, especially at local government level.

Within the concept of community cultural development, local governments' supports on cultural programs and creative industries which are usually associated with the term of creative economy are not framed primarily as a strategy to create alternative economic resources. Rather, local governments often frame the programs broader as part of their interest in bettering the quality of life of their residents. Therefore, within the concept of CCD, developing a community's arts and cultures is not firstly about how to industrialize a community arts and cultural resources. Rather, it is more about how to facilitate a community to better develop and better use its cultural resources to promote the community's distinctiveness and diversity. Later, it is this community's distinctiveness and diversity which may promote a positive atmosphere for the development of creative industries (Booth, 1995; Grogan, Mercer & Engwicht, 1995; Hawkes, 2001; Kins & Peddie, 1996; Mills & Brown, 2004; Sonn, Drew & Kasat, 2002; The Commonwealth Department of Communications and the Arts, 1995; The Phillip Institute of Technology, 1991)

It is often asserted that the development of creative economy requires the establishment of creative atmosphere in the community which may encourage the development of creative ideas and innovations among community members (Eger, 2006). Therefore, its success is determined not only by 'here and now' economic considerations and calculations. To drive a creative atmosphere in a community, there should be a deliberate, long-term, and on-going investment in the community's cultural life in which community can tap its creative energy. It is here that the concept of community cultural development has its relevancy to the notion of creative economy.

In its basic definition, “CCD is a process of engaging local government and the community in the promotion of the importance of culture in the community” (Sonn, Drew & Kasat, 2002, p. 2). In another word, it is a “process whereby the cultural identities of groups within a local area are acknowledged and nurtured through a range of arts and cultural activities” (The Phillip Institute of Technology, 1991). While in the everyday life, as a term, culture is generally associated with any form of art works, especially traditional arts, within the concept of CCD, the term of culture is defined broader. It covers any form of creative expressions of a community’s identity, place and meaning, and their way of life. Or Booth (1995) put it as, “...it encompasses both the arts and humanities...culture in this context is active and participatory, as opposed to more passive appreciation (p. 4).

In a more practical sense, CCD is a process of formulating policies and community programs which will facilitate the engagement of local governments and community groups to develop their cultural resources as part of the community’s social capital which may in turn fuels the community’s economic development (Sonn *et al.*, 2002). Given that CCD is a collaborative process between local governments and community groups, therefore, it could only be undertaken when community members and groups have fair access to participate in or to develop the community’s cultural life (Grogran *et al.*, 1995; Kins & Peddie, 1996; Sonn *et al.*, 2002; The Commonwealth Department of Communications and the Arts, 1995).

As CCD is a collaborative process between local governments and community groups, therefore participation becomes the keyword in its implementation. The success of CCD depends on whether or not its design could facilitate the participation of various groups in the community to develop and live their cultural interests (Grogran *et al.*, 1995; Kins & Peddie, 1996; Sonn *et al.*, 2002; The Commonwealth Department of Communications and the Arts, 1995). Within this frame, therefore local government budget allocation on various community cultural programs which could facilitate the cultural participation of community members should be seen as a long-term investment rather than as a useless spending as it is commonly labelled (Booth, 1995).

Although many agree in the significance role of arts and cultural resources as a renewable community capital, however this view is not always reflected in local governments or other decision makers’ policy regarding community development programs. Generally, a community program targeted for the development of community arts and cultural life will be least prioritized when it is compared to programs intended to boost community economic development (Booth, 1995). It is generally assumed that the better the economic development of a community, the better the other aspects of a community life would be, including its cultural life. Although this view is not always true, however it has been driving many communities to put aside less ‘economic oriented’ programs such as developing community cultural life in the name of advancing community economic development (Hawkes, 2001). The demolition of a historical site which then replaced by a shopping complex or mall as it has happened in several cities in Indonesia is such an example.

Such view above is definitely need to be questioned when a community aims to develop creative economy as its economic backbone. As it is asserted in number of articles about creative economy (Departemen Perdagangan RI, 2008; Gobel, 2008; Oetama, 2008; Rusliana, 2009), cultural richness is the drive of creative economy. Given such consideration, therefore, advancing trade and industrial investments at the cost of the decline of community cultural life may not be an economically strategic decision. It is this kind of perspective that encourages local governments in countries like United States, England and Australia to view the practice of community cultural development as an essential core business (Adam & Goldbard, 2000; Centre for Popular Education, 2002; Matarasso, 1997; Mills & Brown, 2004; Phillips, 2004; Williams, 1996). In Australia for example, as it is noted by Grogan, *et al* (1995), “Since the beginning of 1990’s...local governments...are coming under increasing pressure to get involved in cultural planning as community groups and business interests begin to understand the economic and livability benefits of cultural planning” (p. 3).

The practice of community cultural development in those countries is translated into local governments’ support on developing community art programs. Community arts are a form of cultural practices that uses art as a medium to facilitate the participation of local people in their various communities to express and celebrate their history, culture and identity (Adam & Goldbard, 2002; Fotheringham, 1987; Kelly, 1984). In the next section, the paper will describe how local governments’ support on such programs could contribute in promoting the development of creative economy.

### **Community Cultural Development: When Economic Development takes a Different Route**

The current global financial crisis has led the emerging awareness of the importance of developing economy based on social and ecological merits. In fact, long before the crisis hits, there have been "...growing recognition among those who influence the way our society manages itself that economic benchmarks alone are an insufficient framework upon which to evaluate progress or plan for the future" (Hawkes, 2001, p. 1). It is that fosters the emergence of alternative approaches in envisioning how a society should be managed and rated. The long dominating paradigm of 'economic-driven' society has been proved inadequate to lead a healthy and sustainable society. Social, cultural and ecological basis of a society which have been ignored and marginalized are now getting more consideration for their role in bettering a community quality of life. It is against this background that the concept of CCD gets its recognition among local governments in several countries.

Under the 'economic driven' paradigm, public cultural policy tend to be focused on what Hawkes (2001) noted as the 'industrial' dimension of culture (p. 7). Within this frame, cultural development policies are mainly directed on making culture as a marketable and profitable commodity. Therefore supports to and evaluation of cultural programs are usually decided based on economical 'cost-efficiency' calculations. Social values of cultural programs tend to be least considered. However, through the concept of CCD, such perspective above is questioned. The practice of CCD in several countries shows that developing cultural programs by firstly emphasizing its social values rather than its economical functions could be a strategic approach to promote a more creative and sustainable community (Adam & Goldbard, 2000; Matarasso, 1997; Mills & Brown, 2004; Williams, 1996).

Since the early of 1990s, in countries like Australia, United Kingdom, and United States, the concept of CCD has been implemented through the development of various community based art and cultural programs which are managed by local governments in collaboration with local businesses and community groups. The type of community based art and cultural programs supported by local governments are various. It ranges from small scale art projects such as local community performance groups up to large scale projects like revitalizing a historical site or redesigning public space. Those programs are mostly designed first and foremost to address the communities' social issues, such as promoting community health, ecologically sustainable development, active citizenship, pluralism and cultural diversity (Adam & Goldbard, 2000; Centre for Popular Education, 2002; Matarasso, 1997; Mills & Brown, 2004; Phillips, 2004; Williams, 1996). However, it turns out that besides addressing the social issues as it is primarily targeted, the emergence of such programs above is followed by long-term benefits in other areas including in community economic development. To illustrate this point, in the next section this paper reviews two notable studies about the developmental impacts of community art. The two studies are *Creating Social Capital: A Study of the Long-Term Benefits from Community-Based Arts Funding* (Williams, 1996) and *Use or Ornament: the Social Impact of Participation in the Arts* (Matarasso, 1997). The two studies are chosen because both are longitudinal studies and based on an extensive evaluation of various community art programs.

In her study about the long-term benefits of community based arts funding', William (1996) showed that the presence of community arts projects in a community could bring a series of developmental impacts which include social, educational, artistic and economic impacts. Her study showed that the presence of a community art project had enabled a community to have a better social life as the project could facilitate the community to develop their community identity, increase social cohesion, decrease social isolation, improve inter-group relations, and raise community awareness of an issue. At the same time, the presence of community art projects could also stimulate the emergence of the artistic capacities that the community has. It was reported in the study that the presence of community art projects could improve people's attitudes towards the arts, increase their appreciation of the arts and encourage creativity and the development of community's artistic works. All together, the combination of those social and artistic impacts of having a community art project eventually could bring improvements in the community's economic life. It is because the community art project could encourage sponsorship, create strategic funding partnerships and create new employment opportunities

A similar developmental impacts of community art projects as reported in William's study (1996) was also described in Matarasso's (1997) study about the social impacts of community art projects. The study was primarily aimed at identifying the social impacts of community art projects. Nevertheless, it also showed that in a long term, the accumulation of the social impacts brought by the projects could provide significant economic impacts. The study reports that participating in community art projects could facilitate people to experience personal and communal changes which include 1). Encouraging personal development; 2). Increasing social cohesion; 3).

Promoting community empowerment; 4). Strengthening local image and identity; 5). Fostering community's imagination and vision; and 6). Bettering community's health and well-being. These six findings do indicate mainly the social impacts of community art projects. However, when these social impacts are seen as a long term investment in local communities rather than as an end in itself, then what previously seems to be a social project is in fact a significant economic investment. For example, having better community health and wellbeing will produce savings in public expenditure and increase people's productivity as well. Also, strengthening local image and identity and fostering community's imagination and vision is springboard for promoting a distinct and creative community.

In addition to the two studies above, a more direct link between investment in arts and cultures and economic improvement was described in Stern's study entitled "*Social Impacts of the Arts Projects*" (Stern 1999 cited in the Globalism Institute, 2002). The study aimed to examine the effect of the arts on poor communities in Philadelphia by correlating the level of arts activity in particular communities with the changes in poverty levels. The study found that neighborhoods with many arts and cultural organizations seem to be better in addressing their poverty than of other sections of the city. Based on the findings, the study outlines the link between cultural diversity, the arts and economic development. It concluded that investment in arts could be a way to bring economic improvement for poor communities as the presence of arts and cultural organizations could facilitate the neighborhoods to develop their community capacity.

A brief review on the studies above indicates that estimating the economic value of community art and cultural programs is much broader than about marketing art and cultural products as commercial commodities. It is showed that the economic value of developing community art and cultural programs is laid on its long term investment value of developing local communities' art and cultural capacity. Such studies above provide evidence that developing community art and cultural programs may lead a community into a series of developmental impacts which could generate a positive atmosphere for developing creative economy. Through developmental impacts such as promoting community empowerment, strengthening local image and identity and fostering community's imagination and vision, local communities are developing their renewable creative energy. The studies above highlight not only the importance role of art and culture in developing creative economy, but also the importance of investing in the producer of the art and culture itself, that is local communities. As it has been frequently mentioned, economy powers in the era of creative economy is laid not on the availability of abundance natural resources but more on people's creativity. Putting in this frame therefore, setting up community cultural development framework which could encourage people participation in community art and cultural programs as well as develop their artistic capacity should be seen as an essential and useful strategy in promoting the development of creative economy.

### **Orienting the Concept of CCD into Indonesian Context**

It is frequently mentioned that Indonesian cultural diversity is importance potency for developing creative economy. Many emphasize the significance value of Indonesian cultural diversity as a creative source for the development of various art and cultural products (Departemen Perdagangan RI, 2008; Gobel, 2008; Oetama, 2008; Rusliana, 2009). The question then is how this emphasis on the role of art and culture for the development of creative economy has been considered in the public discourse about creative economy?

Reviewing several articles about creative economy published in national and local newspapers, it is found that the significance role of Indonesia's cultural diversity for the development of creative economy did get highlight by many writers. However, when it comes into recommendations of what should be done to encourage the development of creative economy, there remain a gap in the discussion about integrating the development of community art and culture into the big frame of building the country's creative economy. Many acknowledge the importance of art and culture, but there is still lack discussion on how the three main actors of creative economy – intellectuals, business and government – could work together to better develop them.

Among the recommendations have been made in order to advance the development of creative economy are (1). Improving the quality of education system so that schools and universities can provide a more encouraging environment for fostering young people's creativity (Darwis SN, 2008; Gobel, 2008; Hermana, 2009; Oetama, 2008); (2). Creating a more supportive business atmosphere, such as providing credit schemes for small scale business (Yusuf, 2009), creating domestic market as well as export market for creative industries (Rusliana, 2009);

3. Promoting positive ecosystem for the development of creative communities, such as promoting positive attitudes toward pluralism as appreciation toward diversity could foster creativity (Listiani, 2008), and 4. Building supportive infrastructure such as law enforcement for addressing the issue of piracy and developing adequate information technology (Listiani, 2008; Rusliana, 2009). While valuing all the recommendations above, given the essential role of art and culture in this area, it seems that additional recommendations still need to be explored on how to integrate the development of community art and culture into this scheme. It is here that the concept of CCD may have its' significance.

Referring to references about CCD (Adam & Goldbard, 2000, Grogan, Mercer & Engwicht, 1995; Hawkes, 2001; Kins & Peddie, 1996; Mills & Brown, 2004; Sonn, Drew & Kasat, 2002; The Commonwealth Department of Communications and the Arts, 1995) follow are some features of CCD which make this concept is worth considered in term of integrating the development of community art and culture into the broader scheme of creative economy:

- By supporting local communities to develop their art and cultural resources, CCD enhance the distinctiveness of a community which may in turn provide the community its iconic brand
- The concept of CCD provides a framework for local governments to formulate cultural mapping and cultural planning of their community. The availability of cultural mapping and cultural planning in a community may in turn help local governments to recognise and support community local identity as it is reflected in its public environment, cultural heritage and cultural diversity.
- By having cultural mapping, local communities may have better understanding of their cultural diversity which is crucial for promoting positive attitudes toward pluralism. Positive attitudes toward pluralism itself are an encouraging atmosphere for nurturing creative community.
- Supporting local communities' arts and cultural programs as an implementation of the concept of CCD may enhance local communities' social capital which can facilitate the process of capacity building both at individual and communal level.

The four points of CCD above echo what have been frequently mentioned in the public discourse about creative economy in Indonesia that this country's arts and cultural richness is an important asset. The challenge is how to ensure that cultural mapping and cultural planning made by local governments verify the idea that arts and culture have an essential role in advancing the country's creative economy.

## References

- Adams, D., & Goldbard, A. (2000). *Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development*. New York: The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Adams, D., & Goldbard, A. (2002). *Community, Culture and Globalization*. Retrieved December 14, 2005, from [http://www.comunityarts.net/readingroom/archivefiles/2002/01/community\\_cultu\\_1.php](http://www.comunityarts.net/readingroom/archivefiles/2002/01/community_cultu_1.php)
- Booth, K. (1995). *Culture Builds Communities: A Guide to Partnership Building and Putting Culture to Work on Social Issues*. Washington, DC: Partners for Livable Communities.
- Centre for Popular Education. (2002). *Community Cultural Development in Australia: A Research Map*. Retrieved June 15, 2005, from <http://www.cpe.uts.edu.au/pdfs/CCDMap0307.pdf>.
- Coy, P. (2000). The Creative Economy. *Business Week*, 3696. Retrieved, February 3, 2010, from the Academic Source Premier database
- Darwis, SN. (2008). Ekonomi Kreatif Naik Daun. [The Rise of Creative Economy]. (2008, June 27). *Sinar Harapan*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>
- Departemen Perdagangan RI. (2008). *Pengembangan Ekonomi Kreatif Indonesia: Rencana Pengembangan Ekonomi Kreatif Indonesia 2009 – 2015* [The Development of Indonesia's Creative Economy: The Plan of Developing Indonesia's Creative Economy 2009 – 2015]. Retrieved November 25, 2009 from

[http://www.Departemen Perdagangan RI.go.id/files/publikasi/link\\_khusus/2009/20090313Buku%201%20-%20RENCANA%20PENGEMBANGAN%20EKONOMI%20KREATIF%20INDONESIA%202009.pdf](http://www.Departemen Perdagangan RI.go.id/files/publikasi/link_khusus/2009/20090313Buku%201%20-%20RENCANA%20PENGEMBANGAN%20EKONOMI%20KREATIF%20INDONESIA%202009.pdf)

- Eger, J. M. (2006). Building Creative: the Role of Art and Culture. *The Futurist*, March – April, 18 – 22
- Fotheringham, R. (Ed.). (1987). *Community Theatre in Australia*. North Ryde, NSW: Methuen Australia.
- Gobel, R. (2008). Industri Kreatif, Potensi Besar yang Belum Diprioritaskan. [Creative Industry: Great Potential yet Less Prioritized] (2008, June 16). *Bisnis Indonesia*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>
- Grogan, D., Mercer, C., & Engwicht, D. (1995). *The Cultural Planning Handbook: An Essential Australian Guide*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Hawkes, J. (2001). *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning*. Melbourne, Vic.: Common Ground Publishing.
- Hermana, F. (2009). Tahun Indonesia Kreatif & SDM Berkarakter [The Year of Creative Indonesia and Qualified Human Resource]. (2009, February 5). *Sinar Harapan*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>
- Kelly, O. (1984). *Community, Art and the State: Storming the Citadels*. London, U.K.: Comedia Publishing Group.
- Kins, A., & Peddie, B. (1996). *Planning a Complete Community: A Cultural Planning Guide for Local Government*. Perth, WA: the Community Arts Network WA.
- Kong, L., Gibson., May Khoo., & Semple, A. (2006). Knowledges of the Creative Economy: Towards a Relational Geography of Diffusion and Adaptation in Asia. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 47, 173 - 194
- Listiani, W. (2008). Ekosistem Komunitas Kreatif [the Ecosystem of Creative Community]. (2008, Desember 15). *Pikiran Rakyat*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>
- Matarasso, F. (1997). *Use or Ornament: The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*. Glos: Comedia.
- Mills, D., & Brown, P. (2004). *Art and Wellbeing*. Sydney: The Australia Council for the Arts.
- Oetama, J. (2008). Meraih Peluang Industri Kreatif [Reaching the Chance of Creative Industry] (2008, October 24). *Kompas*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>
- Phillips, R. (2004). Artful Business: Using the Arts for Community Economic Development. *Community Development Journal*, 39, 112 – 122
- Rusliana, I. U. (2009). Mewujudkan Jabar Kreatif [In Making West Java Creative] (2009, February 18). *Pikiran Rakyat*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>
- Sonn, C. C., Drew, N. M., & Kasat, P. (2002). *Conceptualizing Community Cultural Development: The Role of Cultural Planning in Community Change*. Perth, W.A.: Community Arts Network (WA).
- Supratikno, H. (2008). Industri Kreatif dan Kompetensi Penguasaan Teknologi. [Creative Industry and Technology Mastering]. (2008, June 11). *Seputar Indonesia*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>
- The Commonwealth Department of Communications and the Arts. (1995). *Mapping Culture: A Guide for Cultural and Economic Development in Communities*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia

- The Globalism Institute. (2002). *Promoting Mental Health & Wellbeing through Community & Cultural Development: A Review of Literature focusing on Community Arts Practice*. Retrieved May 15, 2005, from <https://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/assets/contentFiles/Promoting%20Mental%20Health%20-%20Arts%20Participation%20.pdf>
- The Phillip Institute of Technology. (1991). *Local Government's Role in Arts and Cultural Development*. Victoria: Local Government and Arts Task Force.
- Williams, D. (1996). *Creating Social Capital; A Study of the Long-Term Benefits from Community-Based Arts Funding*. Adelaide, SA: Community Art Networks of South Australia.
- Yue, A. (2006). The Regional Culture of New Asia. Cultural Governance and Creative Industries in Singapore. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 12, 17 – 33
- Yusuf , H. E. (2009). Peluang Pasar Industri Kreatif. [The Prospective Market of Creative Industry]. (2009, January 15). *Pikiran Rakyat*. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://ekonomi-kreatif.blogspot.com/>