EXPANDING THE CULTURAL TURN IN CULTUREPRENEURSHIP: A GAZE TOWARDS INDONESIA
Memperluas Belokan Budaya pada Culturepreneurship: Sebuah Penglihatan Pandangan terhadap Indonesia

Wahyudi Henky Soeparto

Universitas Ciputra Surabaya
Citraland Boulevard, Surabaya, Indonesia
*e-mail: awahyudi@ciputra.ac.id

Abstract: *Culturepreneurship is a growing subject in Indonesia and in many parts of the world. It is a multi- and trans-disciplinary studies that combines tenets of entrepreneurship and cultural analysis. However, the connexion between these two disciplines are often to be not in complementary. The logic of entrepreneurship still dominates and leaves the cultural aspect of the discipline to be in the periphery. This article attempts to argue the importance of the cultural turn within culturepreneurship by incorporating Cultural Studies into the discussion. Specifically, since it is an initial stage of such effort, this article looks into Raymond Williams' seminal contribution to Cultural Studies. His pioneering ideas on cultural materialism are the footing of later development of Cultural Studies. Other than theoretical discussions on Williams, the latter part of this article explores a case study of the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo to briefly manifest the attempt to do cultural turn in culturepreneurship.*

Key Words: *culturepreneurship, cultural turn, Cultural Studies*

Abstrak*: Culturepreneurship adalah topik yang sedang berkembang di Indonesia dan di banyak belahan dunia. Ini adalah studi multi-dan trans-disiplin yang menggabungkan prinsip kewirausahaan dan analisis budaya. Namun, hubungan antara kedua disiplin ilmu ini seringkali tidak saling melengkapi. Logika kewirausahaan, menurut artikel ini, masih mendominasi dan meninggalkan aspek budaya dari disiplin ilmu tersebut di pinggiran. Artikel ini mencoba untuk memperdebatkan pentingnya belokan budaya dalam culturepreneurship dengan memasukkan Kajian Budaya ke dalam diskusi. Secara khusus, karena ini merupakan tahap awal dari upaya tersebut, artikel ini membahas kontribusi penting Raymond Williams terhadap Kajian Budaya. Ide-ide perintisnya mengenai materialisme budaya adalah landasan bagi perkembangan Ilmu Budaya di kemudian hari. Selain diskusi teoritis tentang Williams, bagian akhir artikel ini mengeksplorasi studi kasus Surabaya Great Expo 2022 untuk secara singkat mewujudkan upaya melakukan belokan budaya dalam culturepreneurship.*

Kata Kunci: *culturepreneurship, belokan budaya, Kajian Budaya*

INTRODUCTION

Culturepreneurship has been an emerging academic discipline for the last decade. Within a geographical context, it is a catchall term that is specifically and widely used under Indonesian academic context (Lupiyoadi et al., 2016). However, this does not mean that a practice of culturepreneurship only happens in Indonesia. Practices of culturerpreneurship manifest in other countries that utilize their specific locality (or even multi-indigenous identity) as *the* capital to boost economic productivity (Bilous, 2015; Loaney, 2019). The discrepancy between theoretical and practical realms of culturepreneurship results in an orifice that may be filled with thousands of damaging interpretations. Thus, dissecting the ontology of culturepreneurship is as important as the efforts to optimally realize its axiology.

Culturepreneurship is a multidisciplinary concept that amalgamates elements of cultural production and entrepreneurship within a socio-economic framework (Suwala,

2015; Walter, 2015). It pertains to the entrepreneurial activities undertaken by individuals, organizations, or collectives within the cultural and creative industries to generate economic value, while simultaneously promoting cultural preservation, innovation, and diffusion. The individuals or groups who perform such feat, known as culturepreneurs, engage in the creation, distribution, and monetization of cultural products, services, or experiences, often navigating the complex interplay between artistic and commercial imperatives (Havadi-Nagy, 2017; Lange, 2009, 2011). This phenomenon underscores the dynamic relationship between culture and the market, emphasizing the role of entrepreneurial actors in shaping cultural landscapes, fostering cultural diversity, and contributing to economic development. Research in culturepreneurship seeks to unravel the intricate mechanisms and impacts of these endeavors, offering insights into the evolving intersections of culture, creativity, and entrepreneurship in contemporary societies.

While studies and practices of entrepreneurship are dominated by the logic of economics, culturepreneurship adds culture as a pivotal dimension to consider in practicing entrepreneurial activities. The variegated nature of culture leads to a different conceptualization of entrepreneurship as well. Owing much to the postmodernist echo of pluralization of narratives, entrepreneurship as a discipline adheres to the consciousness of micro-realities which become more prominent and even venerated in society. This fact leads to an absorption of glocalized thinking for culturepreneurs in executing their ventures (Singh, 2023). For example, in her study on the impact of glocalization in transnational companies Chen notes that an immigrant employee's experience plays out as a significant leverage for the individual in question and as a handy value for the transnational company in question (Chen, 2022). The paradigm of glocalization restructures entrepreneurship's global thinking into multidirectional pathways of lived realities (Soulard & Salazar, 2022). The phrase "locally rooted, globally respected" can thus be understood within this framework (Spielmann et al., 2023).

Going back to the notion of specificity and locality of culturepreneurship, this writing examines the existence of culturepreneurship as a living practice and as an academic matter in Indonesia. Studies which perceive entrepreneurial acts in Indonesia by using culturepreneurship lens can be found in various sources. Marasabessy (2023) examines the tourism in Haruku Island, Molucca by focusing on Islamic communities' roles and influences in the policymaking and practice of many Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSME) of Haruku. The study argues that the embedment of Islamic 'image' in Haruku helps to boost the distinctiveness of Haruku as one of the potential Indonesian tourist destinations. Though different geographically, this study holds a parallelism to Saputra's study of Madina restaurants (Saputra, 2023). Another study by Remawa et al. (2022) focuses on the incorporation of Balinese traditional colors in constructing "Bali" as a distinctive cultural area in Indonesia. The study only takes up on the technical aspects of colors. However, from such effort it can be deduced how even colors have contextual meaning bounded by specific culture. Culture is made up of atomic elements that are both tangible and intangible (Chatzigrigoriou et al., 2021; Hou et al., 2022). Thus, culture should not only be seen from a conventional point of view that often conflates "art" to be the sole signifier of culture. The word "culture" reflects a "way of life" that encompasses every gestural, affective, ideological, and economic activities (Williams, 1961).

As culturepreneurship and culture have been briefly examined in the paragraph above, this article intends to elaborate more on the intertwining of those two as well as providing a case study of Indonesian context. These two aims can be procedurally systematized as follows, 1) the article firstly seeks to discuss cultural paradigms within

culturepreneurship that the author argues needing more exploration, particularly "culture" as seen from the Cultural Studies discipline which is currently flourishing (Grossberg, 2019; Waisbord, 2019), and 2) the article provides a concrete case study which functions as an axiological realization of an epistemological effort performed under the first aim. The latter is a brief outlook towards the Surabaya Great Expo on 24 – 28 August 2022 in Surabaya, Indonesia. It is an entrepreneurial expo carried out as a part of the commemoration of 2022 Indonesian Independence Day. The author participated in that event and communicated with many MSME outlets which will be explained more under the Method section.

METHOD

This study utilized a qualitative method in venturing its two aims as articulated in the Introduction. Regarding the approaches taken here, two distinct ways manifest in this study. Firstly, literature reviews were carried out in realizing the goal of excavating and intertwining Cultural Studies into Culturepreneurship as a discipline. A combination of sources of Cultural Studies and Culturepreneurship—specifically taken from *Culturepreneurship: Membangkitkan Kewirausahaan Bangsa* by Lupiyoadi et al. (2016) which has become a canonical text of Indonesian Culturepreneurship—was utilized and abstracted. Secondly, a brief outlook towards the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo was then carried out. It functioned as a practical instance of analyzing entrepreneurial events under the banner of Culturepreneurship.

The samples of the second part of this article were 144 MSME outlets which participated in the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo. The author engaged in conversations with all outlets to determine not only their products, but also their backgrounds which were also pivotal to comprehend their logic of entrepreneurial practices. Surabaya Great Expo was an event dedicated to advance and expose Surabaya's MSME ventures into national and even international scenes. The event was attended by thousands of participants coming from diverse backgrounds (government officials, general citizens, entrepreneurs, and many more). The expo, then, could also be accentuated as a cultural event rather than simply calling it either as entrepreneurial or economic festivity.

Figure 1
Official poster for 2022 Surabaya Great Expo (Pemerintah Kota Surabaya, 2022)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Cultural Turn in Culturepreneurship

The word "turn" in many academic disciplines has been advocated by many parties who deem that the necessity of transdisciplinary knowledge is getting more important than ever (Chaume, 2018). It reflects an expansion performed by a particular discipline that absorbs the logic and the practice of other disciplines into its own venture. This practice has taken significant place in the academia's consciousness since the middle of the 20th century. One of the popular instances of the growing practice of "turn" is the rejuvenation of Hegelian philosophy (Hegelian turn) in the post-structuralist and postmodernist thoughts (Butler, 2012). Hegelian idealistic consciousness, at the time, fought against the analytical dominance in Philosophy as a discipline. Since then, many turns have dominated other disciplines, ranging from spatial turns (Nieuwenhuis & Crouch, 2017), visual turns (Freitag, 2014), and even ideological turns (André, 2019).

Culturepreneurship is also an example of contemporary turns within a specific set of discipline. However, a question should be appealed in regards to Culturepreneurship. The question goes, "who is absorbing whom?". This question is necessary to be thought of in order to comprehend which discipline has the upper hand, or instead, the two should be absolutely thought of as equal. The latter would sound utopian if Oakley's (2014) discussion remains the case. For Oakley, practices of culturepreneurship put forward culture as the main vision whilst failing to balance the entrepreneurial outcome that is highly needed for its own sustainability. This notion is followed by an empirical study by Quiña who examines the condition of cultural workers in Argentina (2023). He finds that most of the cultural workers in Argentina find difficulty to prosper in a field where cultural life is given little attention and manifest their burden through visual arts. This dynamic is parallel to Yogyakarta where the abundance of mural arts signify the low economic capital that most artists possess (Hariana, 2018). There is still an imbalance in conjoining culture and entrepreneurial paradigm in one set of agenda. It is often to happen where one in the set overshadows the other and dominates the logic of the game. This article argues, based upon the studies which have been carried out before and are reflected here, for the importance to insert the cultural logic within culturepreneurship to tackle the imbalance of culturepreneurial praxis.

The phrase "cultural turn" here echoes Jamesonian analysis on postmodern condition. He asserts that the epochal change of postmodernism redefines culture not as a mere reflection of societal, political, and economic conditions, but rather as a pivotal foundation that structures those three conditions (and other, of course) (Jameson, 1998). This condition puts culture as the basis that drives all sectors appearing in society. In short, culture becomes a prominent factor that should be highly considered rather than be put in a pedestal of ignorance. This is a paradigm in which culture should be inserted within culturepreneurship, firstly, as an academic discipline. Ideally, culture drives or motivates every entrepreneurial activity in any spatial and temporal contexts. However, this culturalizing attempt needs to be carried out not in an exploitative manner. "Exploitative" here refers to the massive commodification processes that dislocates the essence of culture, in the first place, and appropriates it under the aegis of profit-oriented logics (Jameson, 1991, 1998, 2009). The exploitation does not only occur as Jameson projects, but it can also be linked to the empirical conditions which abovementioned studies have put out. The neglects on culture, this article argues, are also an act that as un-cultural as appropriating culture for the sake of economic propeller.

The much-needed effort to bring culture to the analytical discourse and/or weight of culturepreneurship is at the same time bringing a problematic attempt. This self-acclaimed problem surrounds the definition of the word "culture" itself. As the above paragraph cites about the dislocation of the essence of culture, it then entails an essentialist assumption about culture. The author is aware of this slippery terrain that may result in an indictment of essentialism. However, as the author's stance upon this matter, the word "culture" on the one hand should not be seen as a monolithic signifier towards a fixed referent and, on the other hand, should also not be viewed to be a catchall buzzword that includes everything on the academic table.

The concept of culture appears as a specific domain in many culturepreneurship discourses. Loaney (2019) puts culture under a more conventional or traditional tone, that is, an analytical realm where indigenous practices reside and are to be studied. Quiña examines culturepreneurial activities in Argentina as in a specific field of music, thus resulting in the understanding of culture as related to artistic activities (2023; 2018). Borrowing Suwala's reflective analysis, the studies above can be said to walk along the line of the classical dualism of high and low cultures (2015). Leaning away from a conventional view of culture, Sebayang et al. (2020) proceed to do a more economic analysis on culturepreneurial matters. The latter study is a fruitful literature on culturepreneurship as a discipline. However, the "cultural" atmosphere is still absent in each study.

This article then proffers to re-define culture for culturepreneurship. This process does not try to create its own conception of culture, rather it borrows from Cultural Studies discipline. This attempt is twofold. Firstly, it seeks to realize the cultural turn in culturepreneurship. It is a turn which is still lacking in theoretical and practical discussions of culturepreneurship. Secondly, by specifying Cultural Studies as an academic vista to look at, this article argues the importance of Cultural Studies in culturepreneurship. This is fitting since Cultural Studies has an eclectic presence that can be transdisciplinarily inserted into another discipline without having to be a hegemon. It is a paradigm to be set, not simply an indoctrination that should be rigidly pursued (Longhurst et al., 2008).

The following section will elaborate on the role(s) of Cultural Studies in culturepreneurship and the differences of it to the more traditional and conventional approaches of analyzing culture. The article argues that the rich and ever-growing nature of Cultural Studies can be fruitful to the culturepreneurship discipline. Although, it should be noted that the prospective discussion will deal more on the theoretical realm. The praxis of this connection will be explained in the latter part where the author provides a brief gaze towards the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo with a culturepreneurial lens that has been added with Cultural Studies aurality.

Cultural Studies as a Pathway of Culturepreneurship

Cultural Studies is a discipline that firstly found its footing in the 1960s. It emerged under the academic context that often viewed culture to be only related with *haute culture* or high art, a derived term from *haute couture*. The emphasis of that form as a signifier of culture left forms of popular culture such as newspapers, secondary literatures, films, mural arts, mass fashions and so on to be irrelevant in the overall discussion of culture. Responding to this situation, Richard Hoggart alongside with Stuart Hall founded Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham (Connell & Hilton, 2015). CCCS functioned as a platform for researchers to

analyze culture in a more grass-root and quotidian dimension. It sought to embed the notion of culture within popular practices abovementioned.

In its operation, CCCS leaned towards cultural materialism as a paradigmatic basis. It was highly influenced by Raymond Williams's thesis on cultural materialism which was inspired by, but at the same was also different to, Marx's renowned Hegel-inverted historical materialism (Prendergast, 1995). Marx had an idea of bringing the world to focus more on economic spheres rather than the idealistic teleology of *Geist* (Spirit) by Hegel. In so doing, Marx postulated two levels that made up the societal totality, namely base structure (material stuff such as economy and labor) and superstructure (ideal and aesthetic stuff such as culture, religion, art, and so on) (Edara, 2016). In his oeuvre, Marx gave emphasis more on the base structure which he found to be the root of capitalistic problems. Williams saw the fruitfulness of a Marxian analysis and at the same time reconstructed its materialistic tenet. For Williams, the problems of base structure did not only reside in an economic dimension, but there was also an abundance of cultural issues at hand. Culture was deemed to play a key role in the base structure. This is in line to the cultural turn as previously mentioned (Jameson, 1998). Williams' cultural materialism provided a cultural turn for the study of societal totality as Marx had envisioned. Culture was no longer seen as a separate entity to economic activities. It became part and parcel of the economy and vice versa.

The insertion of culture into the economic dimension as well as the other way around is a rejuvenation of culture as a concept compared to a more conventional outlook. Generally, culture had been seen to comprise of artistic activities only. In short, its terminology was often conflated to the ones of *haute culture*. The conflation tends to persist even nowadays in the space where the expansive notion of Cultural Studies does not flourish.

Indonesia, as a matter of fact, is one of the many places where this reality occurs. The discussion on culture is often seen only from the lens of tangible elements. For example—and specifically on culturepreneurship—culture is seen to be a national resources whose appearances are in the form of tangible products (Lupiyoadi et al., 2016). Viewing culture only in the obvious things limits the capability of cultural analysis to move beyond what can only be seen. It is indeed acknowledged that Cultural Studies absorbs Raymond Williams' cultural materialism. However, materialism here cannot be seen as only consisting things that are visually and/or physically material. Assemblages of intensities, affects, circuits of interpersonal relationships with a *differance*-formlike, and even ideologies build up culture as a whole and influence its material body (Buchanan, 2021; Deleuze & Guattari, 1977). In short, an analysis of culturepreneurial activities should go beyond what can only be seen from our unaided eyes.

The re-definition of culture within Cultural Studies—and what should also be the case for culturepreneurship—is structurally built upon Williams' triadic points of the forms of culture which he elaborates in his book entitled *The Long Revolution* (1961, p. 37). On the first Ideal dimension, culture is seen to be a concept where universal values in particular spaces/places are adhered to. This level projects culture as a didactic morale which guides individuals to be in accordance to what is "right" or "perfect" in the society. In Williams' lexicon, this level heavily links to the structure of the feeling of a society in particular epochs (Williams, 1961, p. 40). The second form, known as the Documentary, reflects culture as records of humans' imagination and intellect that are manifested in various forms, such as novel, visual art, film, poem, drama, and so on. This form deals more with an area of aesthetical and ethical criticism towards particular object. The latter form, called as the Social, defines culture as encompassing every minute activity that

happens in ordinary life. This latter form is what revolutionizes the whole conception of culture in modern age. Areas of interests such as pop culture, subculture, and counterculture—as well as affective areas as a site of meaning-making process (Gregg & Seigworth, 2010; Magliano et al., 2017)—are born through this paradigmatic expansion. Williams' three forms of culture bring Cultural Studies closer to Anthropology in terms of its engagement to culture rather than other disciplines (Handler, 1998).

The Social dimension of culture as Williams argues is the dimension which, this article points out, to be still lacking in culturepreneurial activities as well as culturepreneurship analysis in Indonesia. It is important to view the presence of culture in an utmost mundane thing. Specifically, Indonesia is a country where a multitude of ethnicities, races, and classes exist. What can be called as Indonesian culture thus projects a problematic arena since its multitude refuses to be reducible to a homogenous and monolithic identity. However, this problem is something which should be assessed in further studies. This article emphasizes that culture exists in the smallest action, gesture, interaction, and gaze of daily life. Bringing Indonesia as a national context, various Indonesian regional cultures project their identity not only in the form of tangible products (*batik, gamelan, talempong, kecaping, sagu*, and many more ranging from musical instruments to food), but also in intangible form such as affects and belief systems that propel their interactions. In concretely manifesting this argument in culturepreneurship, this article attempts to briefly sketch a Cultural-Studies-infused culturepreneurship analysis of the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo.

A Case Study: 2022 Surabaya Great Expo

The 2022 Surabaya Great Expo was held from 24th of August to 28th of August 2022. It was an event where many Surabaya MSME businesses came into a single space to market their products. Many Surabaya's popular dishes, snacks, crafts, furniture, souvenirs, and so on were showcased at this expo. The attempt to hold this expo was to attract not only visitors coming only from Surabaya and Greater Surabaya, but also nationally since the event was held under the context of the commemoration of Indonesia Independence Day.

Although the event is about Surabaya, the entrepreneurs that participated at this expo were not all coming from Surabaya. From the 144 units coming to this event, there were also present entrepreneurs from Madura, Bali, and Banyuwangi. Different backgrounds from each entrepreneur lead to a different dynamic in managing each venture as well. The outcome of each venture, may it be in the form of foods, clothes, or services, can be homogeneous from a quality vantage point. However, what interests this study—and what should also be the interest of the cultural turn of culturepreneurship in general—is the look towards how culture plays a role in the management of entrepreneurial ventures. This attempt is pivotal not only for the analysis of culturepreneurial activities carried out by academic scholars, but also for the practices of culturepreneurship done by individuals themselves. It cultivates the consciousness of the positionality that, first and foremost, becomes the rule of the game (Inman, 2020). Therefore, an explanation about the characteristics of each culture found in the expo—Surabaya, Madura, Banyuwangi, and Bali—is important to know. This article only sketches a general outlook towards each culture's characteristics. The data on this part were taken from various literature.

Surabaya, the capital of East Java, boasts a rich cultural tapestry characterized by a strong sense of community and collectivism. Surabayans are known for their warm and hospitable behavior, often displaying a willingness to help one another. They prioritize

interpersonal interactions and maintain close-knit relationships with extended family members and friends. Surabaya's culture leans more towards collectivism, as the community plays a pivotal role in individuals' lives (Ida, 2015; Marufa et al., 2021). There's a sense of shared responsibility for each other's well-being, fostering unity and cooperation. When it comes to the orientation towards the future, Surabayans tend to strike a balance between tradition and modernity, valuing progress while cherishing their cultural heritage (Douglass, 2016; Padawangi, 2015). Their balance in viewing the temporality of social lives provide an important capital for their entrepreneurial activities.

Madura, an island located off the coast of East Java, has a unique culture that's distinct from its mainland counterparts. Madurese people exhibit a strong sense of identity, often fiercely defending their individualism. They are known for their independent spirit, and their culture values self-reliance and self-sufficiency. In interactions, Madurese individuals may come across as assertive and confident, sometimes bordering on a strong sense of individualism (Aiyar, 1991; Sobri, 2017). Their orientation towards the future is marked by a pragmatic approach, as they are keen on improving their own well-being and that of their immediate families. Their geographical position which is near Surabaya and the high level of migration of Maduranese people to Surabaya result in conflicts in terms of business activities. Cases of mismatches in Surabaya where Maduranese entrepreneurs work tend to happen (Wisudawan & Ariyani, 2022).

The conflicts are Banyuwangi, a regency located in East Java, is home to a culture that emphasizes harmony and cooperation. Banyuwangi people tend to prioritize communal well-being and maintain close relationships with their neighbors. They often engage in collective activities, such as group ceremonies and communal agricultural work (Ilhami & Ellisais, 2020; Tallapessy, 2019). This collectivist approach means that Banyuwangi's culture leans away from individualism, similar to Surabaya. Their orientation towards the future is often a mix of preserving tradition and embracing progress, striking a balance between these two aspects to ensure the continued well-being of the community.

Bali, the famous island province of Indonesia, is renowned for its unique culture and vibrant traditions. Balinese culture places a significant emphasis on community and social harmony. While they celebrate individualism, Balinese people value their collective identity, often engaging in elaborate ceremonies and festivals together (Pickel-Chevalier & Ketut, 2016; Sumerta, 2011). Among the other three, Balinese people can be said to be the most balanced. Their orientation towards the future is deeply rooted in the preservation of their cultural heritage while being open to modern influences (Geertz, 2022; Hobart, 2011). Balinese individuals at governmental and civil levels have been considered to be the most successful among many Indonesian areas in terms of their ability to carry out policies and interpersonal relationships that are open to different cultures outside Indonesia. Bali is a place where tradition and innovation coexist, fostering a strong sense of identity and a forward-looking perspective. Thus, as Balinese people are considered to be the most "international", they can be said to possess the most profiting capital among other variables. However, this does not result in an instant outcome of success.

The Surabaya participants, armed with their *holopis kuntul baris* philosophy, function collectively within a structured hierarchy. They meticulously provide a long-term plan for their business, emphasizing foresight and strategic thinking. Their approach is marked by a strong sense of teamwork, and they meticulously follow an

established chain of command. This ensures the efficient execution of their business strategies, making them a formidable presence at the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo.

In contrast, the Maduranese participants, known for their *asapo angin*, exhibit a more individualistic approach. While they too operate within a hierarchical structure, their focus is on personal initiative and adaptability. Maduranese participants are willing to embrace risks in the future, even if their plans aren't as clearly defined as their Surabaya counterparts. This approach reflects their resilience and ability to thrive in uncertainty, making them distinctive participants at the Expo.

Banyuwangi participants, on the other hand, work collectively, with a less rigid hierarchy than the other two groups. They share a commitment to providing a long-term business plan, although it might not be as detailed as the plan from the Surabaya participants. Their collective spirit, combined with a relatively more flexible hierarchy, allows them to adapt and respond to market changes while still ensuring future sustainability.

The Balinese participants stand out for their collective efforts, but their approach is heterarchical, emphasizing a balance between individuality and cooperation. Their orientation towards the future aligns closely with Balinese traditional culture, which is deeply rooted in their strong connection to an international audience. Their strategy blends the best of both worlds, promoting the richness of their culture while appealing to a global market, making them a captivating attraction at the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo.

The different cultural dynamics of each entrepreneur at the 2022 Surabaya Great Expo inevitably influences the way they operate their businesses and, of course, the outcome of their products whatever that may be. Williams describes that in the 1960s Britain the awareness of this cultural facet of business has started to develop, although it is still prematurely conceived (1961, p. 163). One set of frameworks that tends to be used for this kind of analysis is Hofstede's cultural dimensions which include power distance (the hierarchy system), individuality, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, indulgence, and long term orientation (Hofstede, 2011). These six elements have been partly used for the analysis of each culture of the expo's participants. This attempt signals that in analyzing culturepreneurial activities, one should also delve into the "cultural" dimension of the business. A man management, as Williams called it, is pivotal to insert this kind of dimension.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that culturepreneurship needs a cultural turn in its operation. It realizes that it only deals under the theoretical field of such call and with such general analysis on the case study being brought upon. Thus, to envisage an opening up of Cultural Studies in culturerpreneurship, the writer hopes that further research on culturepreneurship will deal more with the cultural facet of certain businesses. This article has touched upon Williams' fundamental contribution to Cultural Studies and, very briefly, Hofstede's postulation on cultural dimensions which are helpful for this article's analysis. Other theoretical and practical vistas of Cultural Studies are important to be excavated in order to enrich culturepreneurship. In conclusion, every minute detail that surrounds entrepreneurial activities is as cultural as the businesses' outcomes.

REFERENCES

Aiyar, R. S. (1991). *History of the Nayaks of Madura*. Asian Educational Services.
André, N. M. (2019). The plastic university: knowledge, disciplines and the decolonial

turn. *Decolonisation in Universities: The Politics of Knowledge*, 202.

Bilous, R. H. (2015). 'All mucked up': sharing stories of Yolŋu–Macassan cultural heritage at Bawaka, north-east Arnhem Land. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *21*(9), 905–918.

Buchanan, I. (2021). *Assemblage Theory and Method*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Butler, J. (2012). *Subjects of desire: Hegelian reflections in twentieth-century France*. Columbia University Press.

Chatzigrigoriou, P., Nikolakopoulou, V., Vakkas, T., Vosinakis, S., & Koutsabasis, P. (2021). Is architecture connected with intangible cultural heritage? reflections from architectural digital documentation and interactive application design in three aegean islands. *Heritage*, *4*(2), 664–689.

Chaume, F. (2018). An overview of audiovisual translation: Four methodological turns in a mature discipline. *Journal of Audiovisual Translation*, *1*(1), 40–63.

Chen, W. (2022). Zoom in and zoom out the glocalized network: When transnationalism meets geopolitics and technopolitics. *Information, Communication & Society*, *25*(16), 2381–2396.

Connell, K., & Hilton, M. (2015). The working practices of Birmingham's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. *Social History*, *40*(3), 287–311.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1977). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizoprenia* (R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H. R. Lane (eds.)). University of Minnesota Press.

Douglass, M. (2016). 16 From good city to progressive city. *Insurgencies and Revolutions: Reflections on John Friedmann's Contributions to Planning Theory and Practice*, 173.

Edara, D. (2016). *Biography of a Blunder: Base and Superstructure in Marx and Later*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Freitag, S. B. (2014). The visual turn: approaching South Asia across the disciplines. In *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* (Vol. 37, Issue 3, pp. 398–409). Taylor & Francis.

Geertz, H. (2022). *State and Society in Bali* (Vol. 146). Brill.

Gregg, M., & Seigworth, G. J. (2010). *The affect theory reader*. Duke University Press.

Grossberg, L. (2019). Cultural studies in search of a method, or looking for conjunctural analysis. *New Formations*, *96*(96–97), 38–68.

Handler, R. (1998). Raymond Williams, George Stocking, and fin-de-siècle US anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology*, 447–463.

Hariana, K. (2018). Seni Mural: Ekspresi Transit dan Transisi Masyarakat Urban di Yogyakarta. *Seminar Nasional Seni Dan Desain 2018*, 211–216.

Havadi-Nagy, K. X. (2017). Participatory shaping of historic territory. Civil society and culturepreneurs' actions in the recovery of urban historic landscape in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. *Scienze Del Territorio*, *5*, 93–102.

Hobart, M. (2011). Bali is a brand: a critical approach. *Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies)*, *1*(1), 1–26.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1), 8.

Hou, Y., Kenderdine, S., Picca, D., Egloff, M., & Adamou, A. (2022). Digitizing intangible cultural heritage embodied: State of the art. *Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage (JOCCH)*, *15*(3), 1–20.

Ida, R. (2015). Imagining community in contemporary Surabaya. In *Performing Contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 83–97). Brill.

Ilhami, A. R., & Ellisais, E. (2020). BANYUWANGI CELEBRATION: HOW FESTIVAL CREATE PLACE-MAKING. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, *29*, 292–

297.

Inman, A. G. (2020). Culture and positionality: Academy and mentorship. *Women & Therapy*, *43*(1–2), 112–124.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Duke university press.

Jameson, F. (1998). *The cultural turn: Selected writings on the postmodern, 1983-1998*. Verso.

Jameson, F. (2009). *Valences of the Dialectic*. Verso.

Lange, B. (2009). Accessing markets in creative industries—professionalization and social-spatial strategies of culturepreneurs in Berlin. *Creative Industries Journal*, *1*(2), 115–135.

Lange, B. (2011). Professionalization in space: Social-spatial strategies of culturepreneurs in Berlin. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, *23*(3–4), 259–279.

Loaney, D. R. (2019). Australian Indigenous art innovation and culturepreneurship in practice: Insights for cultural tourism. *Arts*, *8*(2), 50.

Longhurst, B., Smith, G., Bagnall, G., Crawford, G., Ogborn, M., Baldwin, E., & McCracken, S. (2008). *Introducing Cultural Studies*. Pearson.

Lupiyoadi, R., Suryana, Y., Wirasasmita, Y., & Mulyana, A. (2016). *Culturepreneurship: Membangkitkan Budaya Kewirausahaan Bangsa*. Mitra Wacana Media.

Magliano, J. P., McCrudden, M. T., Rouet, J.-F., & Sabatini, J. (2017). The modern reader: Should changes to how we read affect research and theory? In *The Routledge handbook of discourse processes* (pp. 343–361). Routledge.

Marasabessy, A. (2023). Finding Business Opportunities and Business Strategy from Islamic Society Culture. *Al-Insyiroh: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, *9*(1), 76–93.

Marufa, I., Santosa, H. R., & Hayati, A. (2021). Privacy mechanism of communal housing in surabaya. *IPTEK Journal of Proceedings Series*, *6*, 308–314.

Nieuwenhuis, M., & Crouch, D. (2017). *The question of space: Interrogating the spatial turn between disciplines*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Oakley, K. (2014). Good work? Rethinking cultural entrepreneurship. *Handbook of Management and Creativity*, *145*, 145–159.

Padawangi, R. (2015). Constructing progressiveness: The complexity of progressive cities in Surakarta and Surabaya. *International Symposium on the Rise of Progressive Cities East and West, Paris Sorbonne University, May*, 11–12.

Pemerintah Kota Surabaya. (2022). *Surabaya Great Expo 2022*. Pemerintah Kota Surabaya. https://www.surabaya.go.id/id/agenda/68819/surabaya-great-expo-2022

Pickel-Chevalier, S., & Ketut, B. (2016). Towards sustainable tourism in Bali. A Western paradigm in the face of Balinese cultural uniqueness. *Mondes Du Tourisme*, *Hors-série*.

Prendergast, C. (1995). *Cultural Materialism: On Raymond Williams* (Vol. 9). U of Minnesota Press.

Quiña, G. (2023). Scenes of precarity: Conditions, dynamics and challenges for the post-pandemic future of cultural labour in Argentina. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13678779231195644.

Quiña, G. M. (2018). *Culturepreneurship y condiciones del trabajo en las industrias creativas: Una aproximación a partir del caso de la música independiente*.

Remawa, A. A. G. R., Noorwatha, I. K. D., Artadi, I. M. P., Yupardhi, T. H., & Darmastuti, P. A. (2022). WARNABALI: BALINESE COLOR INTENSITY DIVERSIFICATION FOR

DEVELOPMENT OF BALI MODERN INTERIOR AND ARCHITECTURE COATING IN ADDITIVE COLOR ONLINE BASED EXPERIMENT. *Journal of Aesthetics, Design, and Art Management*, *2*(1), 52–62.

Saputra, H. E. (2023). Business Strategies of Muslim Traders in the Madina Restaurant. *4th International Conference on Islamic Economics, Business, Philanthropy, and PhD Colloqium (ICIEBP 2022)*, 24–42.

Sebayang, L. K. B., Utami, S., Putri, V. W., & Fam, S.-F. (2020). Culturepreneurship at Educational System: A Study of Indonesia Students' Entrepreneurial Intention in Facing ASEAN Economic Community. *International Journal of Business & Management Science*, *10*(2).

Singh, A. (2023). Academic Culture: Professional Communication and Entrepreneurship. *Creative Saplings*, *1*(11), 10–20.

Sobri, A. A. Y. (2017). Leadership values in Madurasee culture. *2nd International Conference on Educational Management and Administration (CoEMA 2017)*, 146–151.

Soulard, J., & Salazar, N. B. (2022). Glocalization and tourism experiences. *The Handbook of Culture and Glocalization. Edited by Victor N. Roudometof and Ugo Dessì. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing*, 123–137.

Spielmann, N., Williams, C., & Kohli, A. K. (2023). EXPRESS: Local Roots and Global Responsibility: Terroir Brands and their Responsible Engagement. *Journal of International Marketing*, 1069031X231205255.

Sumerta, J. A. (2011). *Interpreting Balinese Culture: Representation and Identity*. University of Waterloo.

Suwala, L. (2015). Cultural entrepreneurship. In *The Sage Encyclopedia of Economics and Society* (pp. 513–515). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tallapessy, A. (2019). Making the Local Transformative: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Banyuwangi's cultural policy. *Third International Conference of Arts, Language and Culture (ICALC 2018)*, 130–140.

Waisbord, S. (2019). *Communication: A post-discipline*. John Wiley & Sons.

Walter, C. S. (2015). Succession Planning for the Cultural Fine Arts Organization. In *Arts Management* (pp. 372–380). Routledge.

Williams, R. (1961). *The Long Revolution*. Pelican Book.

Wisudawan, R. P. M., & Ariyani, Y. (2022). Manajemen Konflik Pedagang Asal Madura di Surabaya. *Personifikasi: Jurnal Ilmu Psikologi*, *13*(2), 124–136.