Systematic Cultural Entrepreneurship Failure Analysis

TASK OBJECTIVE

Find and analyze 500 documented cultural entrepreneurship failures with sufficient empirical data. Create a comprehensive database analyzing which CIRF framework components each case violated or satisfied.

CIRF FRAMEWORK COMPONENTS (13 Total)

OPERATIONAL PILLARS (1-4):

1. **Economic Value Creation** - Sustainable revenue generation, financial viability, job creation

2. **Cultural Integrity** - Preservation of authentic cultural practices, values, and knowledge

3. **Adaptability** - Capacity to respond to changing conditions while maintaining core identity

4. **Social Empowerment** - Enhancement of community capacity and decision-making participation

COMMUNITY CONTROL FILTERS (5-9):

5. **Community Benefit** - Direct positive impacts on community well-being and development

6. **Cultural Protection** - Active preservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage

7. **Community Relevance** - Alignment with community needs, values, and priorities

8. **Sustainable Development** - Long-term environmental, economic, and social sustainability

9. **Dignity & Empowerment** - Respectful treatment and community self-determination

RESILIENCE CAPACITIES (10-13):

10. **Protective Capacity** - Ability to safeguard cultural assets from external threats

11. **Adaptive Capacity** - Flexibility to adjust while maintaining core cultural identity

12. **Transformative Capacity** - Ability to innovate while preserving essential cultural elements

13. **Generative Capacity** - Creation of new opportunities and value from cultural assets

SEARCH STRATEGY

PRIMARY SEARCH TERMS:

Core Terms: "cultural entrepreneurship failure," "indigenous business closure," "traditional craft business failed," "cultural tourism failure," "ethnic minority business bankruptcy," "social enterprise collapse," "community enterprise failure," "cultural heritage business closed"

Sector-Specific Terms: "artisan cooperative dissolved," "cultural center bankruptcy," "indigenous tourism failed," "traditional craft decline," "cultural festival cancelled," "heritage site closure," "community museum failed"

Geographic Qualifiers: Add country/region names to search terms for comprehensive coverage

DATA SOURCES TO SEARCH:

1. **Academic Databases:** Web of Science, Scopus, JSTOR, ProQuest, Google Scholar

2. **Government Reports:** National archives, economic development reports, cultural policy evaluations

3. **International Organizations:** UNESCO, World Bank, UN databases, OECD reports

4. **Specialized Databases:** Indigenous Studies Portal, Cultural Heritage databases

5. **News Archives:** Major newspapers, trade publications, local media reports

6. **NGO Reports:** Foundation reports, community development evaluations

7. **Legal Databases:** Bankruptcy filings, court records, regulatory violations

FAILURE CATEGORIES TO TARGET:

Business Failures:

- Bankruptcy/insolvency cases

- Market exit/closure

- Business model collapse

- Financial sustainability failures

Operational Failures:

- Project cancellations

- Program discontinuations

- Initiative abandonment

- Service cessation

Cultural Failures:

- Loss of cultural authenticity

- Community rejection/withdrawal

- Cultural commodification backlash

- Heritage damage/loss

Social Failures:

- Community conflict/division

- Loss of community support

- Social impact failure

- Stakeholder abandonment

ANALYSIS PROTOCOL

STEP 1: SYSTEMATIC SEARCH

Search each database using the terms above. For each search:

- Document search terms used

- Record number of results

- Screen results for empirical data quality

- Select cases with sufficient documentation

STEP 2: CASE DOCUMENTATION

For each failure case, extract:

- **Source:** Full citation/reference

- **Location:** Geographic location and cultural context

- **Time Period:** When the failure occurred

- **Sector:** Type of cultural enterprise (tourism, crafts, social enterprise, etc.)

- **Description:** 2-3 sentence summary of the enterprise and why it failed

- **Empirical Evidence:** What data/evidence documents the failure

STEP 3: CIRF COMPONENT ANALYSIS

For each case, assess whether each of the 13 CIRF components was:

- **Present (1):** Evidence shows the component was implemented/addressed

- **Absent (0):** Evidence shows the component was missing/violated

- **Unclear (?):** Insufficient evidence to determine

OUTPUT FORMAT

Create tables with the following structure:

Case#	Source	Location	Sector	Description	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total
1	[Citation]	[Country/Region]	[Type]	[Brief description]	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2/13

Column Explanations:

- Columns 1-13: CIRF components (1=Present, 0=Absent, ?=Unclear)

- Total: Number of components present out of 13

QUALITY CRITERIA

INCLUSION CRITERIA:

- **Empirical Evidence:** Documented with credible sources

- **Clear Failure:** Unambiguous business/project failure

- **Cultural Component:** Involved cultural assets, communities, or heritage

- **Sufficient Detail:** Enough information to assess CIRF components

- **Credible Sources:** Peer-reviewed, government, or reputable organization sources

EXCLUSION CRITERIA:

- **Theoretical Cases:** Hypothetical or purely conceptual examples

- **Insufficient Data:** Lacking detail for CIRF assessment

- **Unclear Outcomes:** Ambiguous success/failure status

- **Non-Cultural:** Lacking significant cultural component

- **Unreliable Sources:** Social media, unverified reports, opinion pieces

SYSTEMATIC APPROACH

PHASE 1: MAJOR DOCUMENTED FAILURES (Target: 100 cases)

Focus on well-documented, high-profile failures with extensive empirical data:

- Major cultural tourism projects that failed

- Indigenous business ventures with documented closures

- Government-funded cultural initiatives that were cancelled

- Large-scale traditional craft cooperatives that dissolved

PHASE 2: REGIONAL FAILURES (Target: 200 cases)

Systematic search by geographic region:

- North America: Indigenous business failures, cultural tourism closures

- Europe: Traditional craft declines, cultural heritage site failures

- Asia-Pacific: Cultural tourism failures, artisan cooperative dissolutions

- Africa: Community-based cultural enterprise failures

- Latin America: Indigenous enterprise closures, cultural project cancellations

PHASE 3: SECTOR-SPECIFIC FAILURES (Target: 200 cases)

Deep dive into specific sectors:

- Cultural tourism enterprise failures

- Traditional crafts and artisan business closures

- Cultural heritage site management failures

- Social enterprises in cultural sectors

- Community museums and cultural centers

- Indigenous economic development failures

- Ethnic minority business failures with cultural components

VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

For each case:

1. **Cross-reference sources** when possible

2. **Verify failure status** through multiple sources

3. **Confirm cultural entrepreneurship categorization**

4. **Validate empirical evidence quality**

5. **Document any limitations or uncertainties**

DELIVERABLE REQUIREMENTS

PRIMARY OUTPUT:

Master Database: Excel/CSV file with all 500 cases in the table format above

SECONDARY OUTPUTS:

1. **Search Documentation:** Record of all searches conducted and results

2. **Quality Assessment:** Documentation of inclusion/exclusion decisions

3. **Pattern Analysis:** Preliminary analysis of most commonly violated CIRF components

4. **Geographic Distribution:** Breakdown of failures by region/country

5. **Sector Analysis:** Distribution across different types of cultural enterprises

6. **Temporal Analysis:** Distribution of failures over time periods

PROGRESS REPORTING:

Report progress in batches of 50 cases, including:

- Running total of cases documented

- Emerging patterns in CIRF component violations

- Quality of available empirical data

- Geographic and sector distribution

- Any search strategy adjustments needed

IMPORTANT NOTES:

1. **Prioritize Quality over Quantity:** Better to have fewer cases with high-quality empirical data than many cases with poor documentation

2. **Cultural Sensitivity:** Ensure respectful representation of cultural communities and avoid extractive approaches

3. **Academic Rigor:** Maintain doctoral-level standards for source quality and evidence evaluation

4. **Systematic Documentation:** Keep detailed records of search procedures and selection criteria

5. **Conservative Coding:** When CIRF component presence is unclear, err on the side of marking as absent rather than making assumptions

This systematic approach will provide comprehensive empirical validation for the CIRF framework by demonstrating patterns of component violations in failed cultural enterprises.