Awareness of Crowdfunding Platforms in Bengaluru City: An Empirical Study

Meghana C. 1 Punith Cariappa²

Abstract

Crowdfunding is a solicitation of funds (generally in small amounts) from multiple investors through a web-based platform or social networking site for a specific project, business venture, or social cause. The concept of awareness, acceptability, and evaluation plays a significant role, reaching more members and the success of campaigns that can benefit society at large. As awareness of crowdfunding among Indians is quite less as compared to developed countries with this background, the present study examined the awareness level of crowdfunding in Bengaluru city and also investigated whether there is an association between gender and awareness of crowdfunding. To accomplish the objectives, the data were collected using non - probability convenience sampling technique using Google Forms from 103 respondents and data were analyzed using suitable statistical techniques using percentage analysis and chi-square test.

Keywords: crowdfunding, awareness, models, platforms

JEL Classification: G23, M20, O43

Paper Submission Date: September 17, 2020; Paper sent back for Revision: November 5, 2020; Paper Acceptance Date:

November 15, 2020

rowdfunding has an old and rich history of finance alternatives, which has deep roots since the 1700s. Even though the concept emerged in the year 1997, it is called as an innovative and inspiring method of finance. Crowdfunding is the open call to the public from the creators to make investments or participate by contributing their interested small contributions to projects, campaigns, ideas, innovation, causes, etc.

The main players of funding are: Creators take the initiative to put their ideas or causes on crowdfunding platforms, which provides opportunities by checking the whole ideas and causes that are worth and real and act intermediate between the creators and investors. Contributors are persons who contribute the sum of amounts towards the liked campaigns.

The crowd's participation in the campaigns determines the success of the campaign and in return, the creators will get the amount for the causes or projects and contributors will get the benefits on an opted model that may be intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and monetary or non – monetary in return.

History of Crowdfunding

Success of crowdfunding was highlighted in the year 1977, where a British rock band collected funds from their fans by using donation-based crowdfunding. After the 2008 financial crisis, the concept grabbed the attention to

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17010/ijrcm/2020/v7i4/157915

Research Scholar, Dayananda Sagar University, Shavige Malleshwara Hills, 1st Stage, Kumarswamy Layout, Bengaluru - 560 078, Karnataka. (Email: meghanac1092@gmail.com); ORCID iD: 0000-0002-7881-0404

² Dean and Professor, School of Commerce and Management, Dayananda Sagar University, Shavige Malleshwara Hills, 1st Stage, Kumarswamy Layout, Bengaluru - 560 078, Karnataka. (Email: dean-scms@dsu.edu.in)

solve many financial problems. It has become an emerged and popular alternative of finance for entrepreneurs, which creates extra advantage like validation of the concept, exposure and getting funding from the crowd based on customer-centric models for both creators and contributors. The industry started growing rapidly in developed and developing countries.

In April 2012, President Barack Obama signed the Jumpstart Our Business Start-ups (JOBS) Act into law and "the crowdfunding bill" was passed. It was signed into a law in April 2012. The Securities Exchange Commission is still in the process of setting regulations to ensure that both investors and entrepreneurs remain protected. Regulations were anticipated to be finalized in early 2013.

The World Bank Report of 2013 showed a rising trend and significance of crowdfunding in developing countries after crowdfunding industries showed a positive impact on a majority of the countries. In the global scenario, it is expected to reach US \$ 28.8 billon by the end of 2025 at a growing CAGR (compound annual growth rate) of 16% between 2018 to 2025.

The concept of crowdfunding is not new in India. Going online is the new acceptability, and evaluation of the concept plays a significant role for success and it can reach more members and benefit society at large. As per a consultation paper 2014 released by SEBI, 'crowdfunding' is a solicitation of funds (generally in small amounts) from multiple investors through a web-based platform or social networking site for a specific project, business venture, or social cause. A standard crowdfunding arrangement involves the portals which host the crowdfunding platform, the issuers who are the people that post the requirement of the funds and its purpose, and the investors who invest their money into funding a project.

Presently, 15 crowdfunding platforms are working in India, which are based on different models and commission rates depend upon the amount raised in the campaign. There are four models in crowdfunding: nonfinancial based – donation based, reward-based, financial based – debt-based, and equity-based funding. It is a mix of owned capital, borrowed capital, contribution capital, and mixed capital sources for the creators and investors. Based on their choice, they can create the campaign and investors have a wide variety of options, where there can choose no returns, reward, and return on investment.

Review of Literature

Presently, crowdfunding platforms are providing financial services to some artists, film-based projects, music albums, and few social-based and individual-based campaigns.

Crowdfunding is nascent and growing in India. It emerged in 2009, following the global financial crisis of 2008. It is growing rapidly and more individuals are engaging in crowdfunding to support start-ups, the film industry, and community development activities (Sharma et al., 2017).

According to Joseph et al. (2019), crowdfunding is growing at a rapid rate and is seen as a serious way of raising funds for start-ups and new businesses. The U.S. and other economies have enforced crowdfunding laws. India has not yet implemented any crowdfunding law, but appropriate laws will soon be introduced to support this in an immense way.

Nagalakshmi and Cecilia (2014) pointed out that there is no question that crowdfunding is easily seen as a serious way to collect funds for start-ups and innovative ideas. India will soon enact the necessary legislation to help this in a large way.

According to Agarwal (2018), the rules and regulations regulating crowdfunding have not been clearly defined, and thus, many of the campaigns are carried out with scarcely any oversight to mitigate risk and fraud. The funds may be used for any other reason rather than for the purpose for which they have been raised. The investors do not get a proper return on capital, and there are minimal mechanisms of follow-up.

In order to suit different publishing scenarios, organizations are modifying templates used by consumerfocused crowdfunding websites. Crowdfunding for open access pools funds from individuals and libraries to provide open access licenses to books that have already been published with support from repositories who want to contribute to a specific collection or an ongoing reveal digital launches freely available collections (Bulock, 2018).

Research Objectives

- (1) To study the crowdfunding process and platforms.
- (2) To find the awareness levels of crowdfunding in Bengaluru.
- (3) To examine the association between gender and awareness of crowdfunding.

Research Methodology

The study is based on an online survey method using a structured questionnaire through Google Forms that was collected from the respondents with the time frame of two months, that is, May – June 2020. The questionnaire obtained demographical characteristics, awareness questions like other financial alternatives known, awareness of crowdfunding sources online or offline, models, and platforms. The respondents were asked to rate their responses on a 5 - point Likert scale. The study adopted convenience sampling under the non-probability sampling method. The sample consisted of 103 respondents from Bengaluru city. Based on the thumb rule, the sample was selected. Statistical software SPSS was used for analysis. Percentage and chi-square test as well as cross tabulation are used for data analysis.

Hypotheses

⇔ H₀: There is no association between gender and awareness of crowdfunding.

🖔 H_a: There is an association between gender and awareness of crowdfunding.

Data Analysis and Results

The demographic characteristics of the respondents can be easily deduced from Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Darticulars		Eroguoney	Percentage
Particulars		rrequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	51	49.5
	Female	52	50.5
	Total	103	100
Age (in years)	Below 20	28	27.2
	21–30	58	56.3
	31–40	11	10.7
	41–50	5	4.9
	51–60	1	1
	61–70	0	0
	71 and Above	0	0
	Total	103	100
Education	No Education	0	0
	Age (in years)	Particulars Gender Male Female Total Age (in years) Below 20 21–30 31–40 41–50 51–60 61–70 71 and Above Total	Particulars Frequency Gender Male 51 Female 52 Total 103 Age (in years) Below 20 28 21-30 58 31-40 11 41-50 5 51-60 1 61-70 0 71 and Above 0 Total 103

		SSLC	4	3.9
		PUC	6	5.8
		Under Graduate	59	57.3
		Post Graduate	30	29.1
		Doctorate	4	3.9
		Total	103	100
4	Occupation	Employee/ Salaried Person	36	35
	Entr	epreneur – Self-employed or Business	3	2.9
		Professional	7	6.8
		Stay at home	5	4.9
		Student	49	47.6
		Others	3	2.9
		Total	103	100
5	Income (in INR)	Below 3,00,000	42	40.8
		3,00,001 – 5,00,000	21	20.4
		5,00,001 – 10,00,000	2	1.9
		10,00,001 - 15,00,000	2	1.9
		Above 15,00,001	36	35
		Other	0	0
		Total	103	100

Table 2 shows the online and offline sources of awareness of crowdfunding by the respondents by considering four offline modes and eight online modes. Sources that create an impact towards awareness towards crowdfunding are tested in the study. It is found in the offline modes, press or news, friends, and government department had a greater impact and in the online sources, Twitter and Instagram had more impact to create awareness about crowdfunding among the respondents.

Table 2. Sources of Awareness of Crowdfunding (Offline and Online Awareness)

Offline – Word of Mouth						
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		
Valid	Not at all Aware	36	35.0	35.0		
	Slightly Aware	44	42.7	42.7		
	Moderately Aware	23	22.3	22.3		
	Total	103	100.0	100.0		
		Offline – Press or News				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent		
Valid	Not at all Aware	44	42.7	42.7		
	Slightly Aware	21	20.4	20.4		
	Moderately Aware	15	14.6	14.6		
	Very Aware	13	12.6	12.6		
	Extremely Aware	10	9.7	9.7		
	Total	103	100.0	100.0		

		Offline – Friends		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	37	35.9	35.9
	Slightly Aware	22	21.4	21.4
	Moderately Aware	24	23.3	23.3
	Very Aware	10	9.7	9.7
	Extremely Aware	10	9.7	9.7
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Offline – Govt. Department		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	44	42.7	42.7
	Slightly Aware	19	18.4	18.4
	Moderately Aware	20	19.4	19.4
	Very Aware	9	8.7	8.7
	Extremely Aware	11	10.7	10.7
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Online – Social Media		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	51	49.5	49.5
	Slightly Aware	23	22.3	22.3
	Moderately Aware	16	15.5	15.5
	Very Aware	7	6.8	6.8
	Extremely Aware	6	5.8	5.8
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Online – Facebook		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	63	61.2	61.2
	Slightly Aware	24	23.3	23.3
	Moderately Aware	6	5.8	5.8
	Very Aware	2	1.9	1.9
	Extremely Aware	8	7.8	7.8
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Online - Twitter		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	48	46.6	46.6
	Slightly Aware	14	13.6	13.6
	Moderately Aware	18	17.5	17.5
	Very Aware	7	6.8	6.8
	Extremely Aware	16	15.5	15.5
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Online – YouTube		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	56	54.4	54.4
	Slightly Aware	12	11.7	11.7

	Moderately Aware	18	17.5	17.5
	Very Aware	10	9.7	9.7
	Extremely Aware	7	6.8	6.8
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Online – Instagram		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	43	41.7	41.7
	Slightly Aware	14	13.6	13.6
	Moderately Aware	21	20.4	20.4
	Very Aware	14	13.6	13.6
	Extremely Aware	11	10.7	10.7
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Online – LinkedIn		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	48	46.6	46.6
	Slightly Aware	13	12.6	12.6
	Moderately Aware	26	25.2	25.2
	Very Aware	6	5.8	5.8
	Extremely Aware	10	9.7	9.7
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
		Online – Whatsapp		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	65	63.1	63.1
	Slightly Aware	15	14.6	14.6
	Moderately Aware	15	14.6	14.6
	Very Aware	2	1.9	1.9
	Extremely Aware	6	5.8	5.8
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
	Onli	ne – Online Advertisemer	nts	
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	40	38.8	38.8
	Slightly Aware	13	12.6	12.6
	Moderately Aware	23	22.3	22.3
	Very Aware	17	16.5	16.5
	Extremely Aware	10	9.7	9.7
	Total	103	100.0	100.0

Table 3 shows the awareness of different models of crowdfunding among the respondents. It is observed that compared to all five models of crowdfunding, respondents were more aware of donation and debt-based models. Table 4 shows the awareness levels of Indian based crowdfunding platforms among the respondents. Among 15 crowdfunding platforms, respondents were extremely aware of Dream Wallets and Fueladream.

Table 3. Awareness of Crowdfunding Model

	Dona	tion Model Working in Ind	lia	
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	45	43.7	43.7
	Slightly Aware	18	17.5	17.5
	Moderately Aware	22	21.4	21.4
	Very Aware	6	5.8	5.8
	Extremely Aware	12	11.7	11.7
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
	Rev	ard Model Working in Indi	ia	
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	69	67.0	67.0
	Slightly Aware	14	13.6	13.6
	Moderately Aware	11	10.7	10.7
	Very Aware	3	2.9	2.9
	Extremely Aware	6	5.8	5.8
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
	De	bt Model Working in India	1	
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	51	49.5	49.5
	Slightly Aware	17	16.5	16.5
	Moderately Aware	9	8.7	8.7
	Very Aware	10	9.7	9.7
	Extremely Aware	16	15.5	15.5
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
	Equ	uity Model Working in India	a	
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	56	54.4	54.4
	Slightly Aware	13	12.6	12.6
	Moderately Aware	15	14.6	14.6
	Very Aware	10	9.7	9.7
	Extremely Aware	9	8.7	8.7
	Total	103	100.0	100.0
	Roy	alty Model Working in Ind	ia	
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	55	53.4	53.4
	Slightly Aware	22	21.4	21.4
	Moderately Aware	17	16.5	16.5
	Very Aware	4	3.9	3.9
	Extremely Aware	5	4.9	4.9
	Total	103	100.0	100.0

	Table 4. Awareness of Crowdfunding Platforms					
			RangDe			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Not at all Aware	62	60.2	60.2	60.2	
	Slightly Aware	15	14.6	14.6	74.8	
	Moderately Aware	14	13.6	13.6	88.3	
	Very Aware	7	6.8	6.8	95.1	
	Extremely Aware	5	4.9	4.9	100.0	
	Total	103	100.0	100.0		
			Faircent			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Not at all Aware	66	64.1	64.1	64.1	
	Slightly Aware	19	18.4	18.4	82.5	
	Moderately Aware	11	10.7	10.7	93.2	
	Very Aware	5	4.9	4.9	98.1	
	Extremely Aware	2	1.9	1.9	100.0	
	Total	103	100.0	100.0		
			Ketto			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Not at all Aware	69	67.0	67.0	67.0	
	Slightly Aware	15	14.6	14.6	81.6	
	Moderately Aware	12	11.7	11.7	93.2	
	Very Aware	2	1.9	1.9	95.1	
	Extremely Aware	5	4.9	4.9	100.0	
	Total	103	100.0	100.0		
			Wishberry			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Not at all Aware	71	68.9	68.9	68.9	
	Slightly Aware	12	11.7	11.7	80.6	
	Moderately Aware	11	10.7	10.7	91.3	
	Very Aware	7	6.8	6.8	98.1	
	Extremely Aware	2	1.9	1.9	100.0	
	Total	103	100.0	100.0		
			Fuela Dream			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Not at all Aware	66	64.1	64.1	64.1	
	Slightly Aware	11	10.7	10.7	74.8	
	Moderately Aware	11	10.7	10.7	85.4	
	Very Aware	2	1.9	1.9	87.4	
	Extremely Aware	13	12.6	12.6	100.0	
	Total	103	100.0	100.0		
			Catapooolt			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Not at all Aware	68	66.0	66.0	66.0	

	Slightly Aware	13	12.6	12.6	78.6
	Moderately Aware	13	12.6	12.6	91.3
	Very Aware	6	5.8	5.8	97.1
	Extremely Aware	3	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	
			Bit Giving		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	68	66.0	66.0	66.0
	Slightly Aware	11	10.7	10.7	76.7
	Moderately Aware	11	10.7	10.7	87.4
	Very Aware	7	6.8	6.8	94.2
	Extremely Aware	6	5.8	5.8	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	
			Crowdera		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	70	68.0	68.0	68.0
	Slightly Aware	15	14.6	14.6	82.5
	Moderately Aware	12	11.7	11.7	94.2
	Very Aware	4	3.9	3.9	98.1
	Extremely Aware	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	
			Milaap		
		Frequency	Milaap Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	Frequency 70	•	Valid Percent 68.0	Cumulative Percent 68.0
Valid	Not at all Aware Slightly Aware		Percent		
Valid		70	Percent 68.0	68.0	68.0
Valid	Slightly Aware	70 9	Percent 68.0 8.7	68.0 8.7	68.0 76.7
Valid	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware	70 9 12	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7	68.0 8.7 11.7	68.0 76.7 88.3
Valid	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware	70 9 12 8	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1
Valid	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware	70 9 12 8 4	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1
Valid	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware	70 9 12 8 4	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1
Valid Valid	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total	70 9 12 8 4 103	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware Moderately Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13 8	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6 89.3
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13 8	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6 89.3 97.1
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13 8 8	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6 89.3 97.1
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13 8 8	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9 100.0	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6 89.3 97.1
	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13 8 8 3 103	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9 100.0 Dream Wallets	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9 100.0	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6 89.3 97.1 100.0
Valid	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13 8 8 3 103	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9 100.0 Dream Wallets Percent	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9 100.0 Valid Percent	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6 89.3 97.1 100.0
Valid	Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware Slightly Aware Moderately Aware Very Aware Extremely Aware Total Not at all Aware	70 9 12 8 4 103 Frequency 71 13 8 8 3 103 Frequency 59	Percent 68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Impact Guru Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9 100.0 Dream Wallets Percent 57.3	68.0 8.7 11.7 7.8 3.9 100.0 Valid Percent 68.9 12.6 7.8 7.8 2.9 100.0 Valid Percent 57.3	68.0 76.7 88.3 96.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 68.9 81.6 89.3 97.1 100.0 Cumulative Percent 57.3

	Extremely Aware	15	14.6	14.6	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	
			Start51		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	66	64.1	64.1	64.1
	Slightly Aware	10	9.7	9.7	73.8
	Moderately Aware	9	8.7	8.7	82.5
	Very Aware	9	8.7	8.7	91.3
	Extremely Aware	9	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	
			Fund Dreams India	9	
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	66	64.1	64.1	64.1
	Slightly Aware	14	13.6	13.6	77.7
	Moderately Aware	14	13.6	13.6	91.3
	Very Aware	6	5.8	5.8	97.1
	Extremely Aware	3	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	
			Ignite Intent		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	73	70.9	70.9	70.9
	Slightly Aware	13	12.6	12.6	83.5
	Moderately Aware	10	9.7	9.7	93.2
	Very Aware	4	3.9	3.9	97.1
	Extremely Aware	3	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	
			The Hot Start		
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all Aware	65	63.1	63.1	63.1
	Slightly Aware	14	13.6	13.6	76.7
	Moderately Aware	10	9.7	9.7	86.4
	Very Aware	5	4.9	4.9	91.3
	Extremely Aware	9	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	103	100.0	100.0	

Table 5. Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.837°	3	0.841
Likelihood Ratio	0.841	3	0.84
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.612	1	0.434
N of Valid Cases	103		

Note. ^a 4 cells (50.0%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.98.

Table 5 shows the results of significance – whether there is any association between gender and awareness of the concept of crowdfunding. From the prob. chi-square analysis, it is evidenced that the *p*-value of Pearson chi-square is (0.841), which is more than the significance level at 5% with 3 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the test shows no association between gender and awareness of crowdfunding. Hence, we conclude that the null hypothesis is accepted.

The study shows there is a lack of awareness among the people regarding the concept of crowdfunding, working models, advertising, and crowdfunding platforms and there is no association between gender and awareness levels. Proper initiatives should be taken to advertise and create awareness regarding crowdfunding models and awareness relating to crowdfunding platforms so that it can become a successful alternative for raising finances, and helps many individuals, leading to the growth of the crowdfunding industry in India.

Conclusion

It is observed from the study that respondents had little awareness or the majority of the respondents were not aware of the concept of crowdfunding as well as the models and platforms available in India as compared to developed countries. The respondents felt that it is an unauthorized sector of investment; there are no laws relating to crowdfunding; online transactions; no advertisements, and no government initiatives, plans, and schemes, which may be the reasons for less awareness of the concept. Proper awareness regarding crowdfunding will aid in making funding available to many individuals, creators, investors, and NGOs to perform better and generate employment and save the lives of people. The crowdfunding concept can positively impact more members and lead to the success of crowdfunding campaigns, which can benefit the society at large.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Further Research

In the study, the respondents may not have had complete awareness of the concept and they might have given biased information, which may have an impact on the results obtained. In this study, only general awareness related to crowdfunding has been taken into consideration. In the future, researchers can consider a larger sample size to ascertain the awareness levels of crowdfunding, platforms considered for raising funds, and how the crowdfunding campaigns impact the lives of the creators of such campaigns.

Authors' Contribution

Meghana C. conceived the idea and developed the qualitative design to undertake the empirical study and extracted research papers with high repute, filtered these based on keywords, and generated concepts and codes relevant to the study design. Dr. Punith Cariappa verified the analytical methods and supervised the study and did the corrections in the questionnaire. Meghana C. did the numerical computations using SPSS 20.0.

Conflict of Interest

The authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest, or non-financial interest in the subject matter, or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Funding Acknowledgement

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or for the publication of this article.

References

- Agarwal, H. (2018). A study on crowdfunding. International Journal of Engineering Technology Science and Research (IJETSR), 5(1), 899–905.
- Bulock, C. (2018). Crowdfunding for open access. Serials Review, 44(2), 138-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2018.1472477
- Joseph, J., Nithin, A. E., & Valarmathi, B. (2019). Awareness towards crowdfunding among young, budding and prospective entrepreneurs in Bangalore. IJRAR - International Journal of Research and Analytical *Reviews*, *6*(1), 544–549.
- Nagalakshmi, S., & Cecilia, U. G. (2014). Crowd funding An emerging trend in India. *International Journal of* Scientific Research, 3(4), 71–73.
- Sharma, G. V., Yadav, A. S., & Udupa, P. N. (2017). Crowdfunding in India: An empirical study. *International Journal* of Advances Research, 7(3), 935–942. https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/8719

About the Authors

Meghana C. is currently an Assistant Professor at the Dayananda Sagar College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Bangalore and is pursuing Ph.D. from Dayananda Sagar University-Bangalore in the area of finance. She has attended many national and international conferences and has written research papers.

Dr. Punith Cariappa is currently a Professor and Dean at the School of Commerce and Management, Dayananda Sagar University, Bangalore. Dr. Punith Cariappa is a guest faculty at IIM-B and has 24 years of teaching/training experience. Her area of research is human resource accounting. She has published research papers in many national and international conferences.