



A Study On The Awareness Level Of Crowdfunding In Coimbatore City

Ms. P. Maheswari, M.Com(CA), M.Phil., PGDCA., Ph.D,

Kathirvel E

Assistant Professor

Student, III B. Com (PA) - B

Department of Commerce with Professional Accounting
Dr. N.G.P. Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, India

Department of Commerce with Professional Accounting
Dr. N.G.P. Arts and Science College, Coimbatore, India

Abstract: This study explores the awareness level of crowdfunding in Coimbatore City, particularly in the context of conscious marketing. As crowdfunding emerges as an alternative financing tool, it offers opportunities for supporting socially and environmentally conscious initiatives. The research examines public awareness, focusing on how technology and transparency impact crowdfunding participation. Using a mixed-methods approach including surveys and interviews, the study reveals significant engagement among young males aged 18 to 24, primarily in urban areas. While crowdfunding is seen as an effective way to support innovation, trust issues and the lack of traditional financial intermediaries remain obstacles. Social media platforms play a crucial role in promoting campaigns, but education on technology and transparency is needed to boost awareness and participation. Promoting socially conscious campaigns can enhance the impact of crowdfunding, resonating with the values of today's socially aware population.

Keywords: Crowdfunding, Conscious Marketing, Coimbatore, Awareness, Social Impact.

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's world of rapid technological advancement and globalization, the landscape of commerce is undergoing a significant shift. As consumers become more informed and discerning, businesses are increasingly demanding transparency and responsibility. This has led to the concept of conscious marketing, which focuses on aligning business objectives with societal and environmental values. Conscious marketing is about creating value for all stakeholders, including employees, customers, communities, and the planet. It goes beyond just selling products or services; it involves fostering meaningful connections, building trust, and making a tangible difference in the world. Crowdfunding has emerged as a powerful tool for driving awareness and support for socially and environmentally conscious initiatives. Platforms like Kickstarter, Indiegogo, and GoFundMe provide individuals and organizations unprecedented access to funding and resources, democratizing the funding process. Crowdfunding also offers a unique opportunity to engage with and empower communities by involving backers in the creative process, sharing updates, and soliciting feedback. This connection not only enhances the success of the campaign but also lays the foundation for long-term relationships and advocacy.

In "Creating Impact: Crowdfunding for Conscious Marketing Awareness," this comprehensive exploration delves into the symbiotic relationship between crowdfunding and conscious marketing, uncovering strategies, tactics, and best practices for leveraging this powerful combination to drive meaningful change. The book explores the foundational principles of conscious marketing, exploring how businesses can align their values with those of their customers and society at large. It then explores the world of crowdfunding, exploring different types of platforms, the mechanics of running a successful campaign, and the pitfalls to avoid. The book then dives into the intersection of crowdfunding and conscious marketing, exploring how these two forces can complement and reinforce each other. It also looks to the future, exploring emerging trends and innovations in the world of crowdfunding and conscious marketing.

Whether you're an entrepreneur, socially conscious investor, or passionate about driving positive change, "Creating Impact" offers a comprehensive guide to leveraging the power of crowdfunding for conscious marketing awareness.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This study observes the following researches for references, **Crowdfunding Industry Report (2012)**, Market Trends, Composition and Crowdfunding Platforms. The report, based on the comprehensive Crowdfunding Industry Report, provides a detailed analysis of crowdfunding market trends, platforms, and their functions and various models. **Goran Calic & Elaine Mosakowski (2016)**, Kicking Off Social Entrepreneurship: How A Sustainability Orientation Influences Crowdfunding Success. The paper explores whether new financial institutions like crowdfunding have emerged to address the growing societal demand for and support of social entrepreneurship, highlighting the influence of entrepreneurs' resource acquisition on commercial and social venture success. **Silvio Vismara (2018)**, Sustainability in Equity Crowdfunding. The study explores the performance of sustainability-oriented equity crowdfunding offerings, finding that while sustainability doesn't increase the chances of success, it attracts more restricted investors. Professional investors value private appropriation of value, while small investors are more sensitive to community logic. **Testa & Stefania (2018)**, The Role of Crowdfunding in Moving towards a Sustainable Society. The authors express gratitude for their contributions to the SI, including editing and modifying articles based on reviewers' comments. They also acknowledge Professor Fred Phillips' support, the Editorial Staff's insightful advice, and the numerous reviewers' valuable contributions for efficiency and effectiveness. **N G Filimonova & M G Ozerova (2019)**, Crowdfunding as the way of projects financing in agribusiness. Research shows that Russian agrarian sector entrepreneurs require alternative financing sources like crowdfunding, but there's no clear criteria for success. Factors like population income and internet availability significantly impact crowdfunding success, but not fixed assets or agricultural product manufacturing index. **Myung Ja Kim & C. Michael Hall (2020)**, Do value-attitude-behavior and personality affect sustainability crowdfunding initiatives? - The study reveals that consumers' beliefs significantly influence their attitudes towards sustainability crowdfunding, leading to behavior. Value also significantly influences personal norms on sustainability participation, influencing SDG crowdfunding behavior. This highlights the importance of understanding individual participation behavior in sustainability crowdfunding. **Natalia Maehle (2020)**, Sustainable Crowdfunding: Insights from the Project Perspective. The paper explores sustainable crowdfunding from a project perspective, highlighting its unique challenges for sustainable entrepreneurs who struggle to attract traditional investors and have limited financial resources for project launch. It emphasizes the importance of understanding how to utilize this alternative finance source. **Tingting Fan & Leilei Gao (2020)**, The Small Predicts Large Effect in Crowdfunding. The research reveals that people are more likely to contribute to a new project when early contributions are relatively small, supported by real-world crowdfunding data and an incentive-compatible experiment. This Small Predicts Largest Effect is driven by potential funders' inferences. **Yang Xua & Wen Song (2020)**, The roles of crowdfunding: financing, point provision and ex-post production. This study examines the operational mechanisms of crowdfunding, comparing it to traditional sales. It reveals that threshold setting, ex-post production, and financing mechanisms contribute to the best performance of crowdfunding. The adoption of crowdfunding offers consumers benefits like lower prices or higher quality, and better chances of product availability. **Bonnie Simpson & Martin Schreier (2021)**, Making the World a Better Place: How Crowdfunding Increases Consumer Demand for Social-Good Products. Six studies show that consumer demand for social-good products increases when crowdfunding versus purchasing, partly due to the activation of an interdependent self-construal. These findings are based on real behavioral outcomes in campus, online environments, and online preferences, using various product stimuli and construct operationalizations. **Koren M. Jo & Shuo Yang (2021)**, Is There Crowd Wisdom in Accounting? Evidence From Forecasts in Equity-Based Crowdfunding. The article examines the optimistic forecast bias in equity-based crowdfunding by comparing verifiable financial statements from entrepreneurs with their government annual reports, revealing investors respond to higher sales and financing choices. **Michael Wessel & Rob Gleasure (2021)**, Sustainability of Rewards-Based Crowdfunding: A Quasi-Experimental Analysis of Funding Targets and Backer Satisfaction. The study highlights a significant issue with rewards-based crowdfunding platforms like Kickstarter, revealing that the AON funding mechanism leads to falling backer satisfaction, prompting research for new market mechanisms to maintain incentive compatibility. **Chen Zhou & Manpreet Gill (2022)**, Empowering Education with Crowdfunding: The Role of Crowdfunded Resources and Crowd Screening. This research explores the effectiveness of crowdfunded resources in

improving student academic achievement in K-12 public education, focusing on project types and their impact on offline complex public service outcomes. **Kelly B. Herd & Girish Mallapragada (2022)**, Do Backer Affiliations Help or Hurt Crowdfunding Success. The study reveals a negative impact of affiliation on crowdfunding success of ideas, with vicarious moral licensing as the underlying mechanism. The research also explores the moderating role of creator and backer engagement, suggesting that licensing reduces backers' perceived obligation to fund ideas. The findings have economic implications and potential future research directions. **Paulami Mitra & Frank Janssen (2022)**, Social entrepreneurial crowdfunding: Influence of the type of rewards and of prosocial motivation on the crowds' willingness to contribute. The research provides valuable insights into social entrepreneurial crowdfunding, highlighting motivation sources, rewards, and prosocial motivation. This knowledge can help social entrepreneurs create strategies to attract a relevant crowd and leverage alternative financial resources, ultimately enhancing the social economy and social impact. **Xuechen Luo & Ling Ge (2022)**, CROWDFUNDING FOR MICROFINANCE INSTITUTIONS: THE NEW HOPE? The study explores the impact of crowdfunding on Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MFIs) and the mechanisms driving these changes. Results show that after using Kiva, MFIs' sustainability improves and interest rates decrease, fulfilling their social mission. **Yanhao "Max" Wei & Jihoon Hong (2022)**, Machine Learning for Creativity: Using Similarity Networks to Design Better Crowdfunding Projects. The analysis reveals that the similarity network is a crucial tool for predicting project success, especially when controlling project and creator characteristics. **Mingfeng Lin & Richard W. Sias (2023)**, Experts Vs. Nonexperts in Online Crowdfunding Markets. The simulations reveal that signal quality may be stronger in equity crowdfunding due to greater information asymmetries and that nonexperts' learning opportunities may be greater in equity crowdfunding markets, as experts are less likely to fund entire equity issuances. **Sofia Bapna & Martin Ganco (2023)**, Equity Crowdfunding and Access to Capital for user Entrepreneurs: Evidence from A Randomized Field Experiment. Investors may perceive user innovator firms as having strengths and weaknesses compared to traditional producers, with positive perceptions relating to product novelty and negative perceptions relating to market size and founder's ability to operate and grow the firm. **Sunghan Ryu & Keongtae Kim (2023)**, Crowdfunding Success Effects on Financing Outcomes for Startups: A Signaling Theory Perspective. The study, using signaling theory, found that crowdfunding startups are less likely to receive follow-on VC investments than angel-backed startups, suggesting that startups choosing crowdfunding over angel investing face a disadvantage in securing subsequent VC funding.

III. OBJECTIVE

The objectives of the study are

1. To Study the Socio-economic background of the sample respondents.
2. To assess the level of awareness on crowdfunding in the study area.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study employs a mixed-methods approach with an analytical research design to explore the awareness of crowdfunding and its connection to conscious marketing in Coimbatore City. Using random sampling, data is collected from 60 respondents through structured surveys covering demographics, crowdfunding engagement, perceptions, and factors influencing awareness. The data is analyzed using percentage analysis to identify response patterns, Likert scale analysis to gauge attitudes toward crowdfunding, and rank correlation to explore relationships between influencing factors and awareness levels. Tools such as percentage analysis, Likert scale analysis, and rank analysis are used to draw insights, offering valuable recommendations for enhancing crowdfunding participation and its alignment with conscious marketing efforts.

V. ANALYSIS

1. Simple Percentage Analysis

Based on the Simple Percentage Analysis we have the following findings:

TABLE NO 1.1

S.NO	PARICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Under 18	1	1.6
2	18-24	41	67.2
3	25-34	14	23
4	35 and above	5	8.2
TOTAL		61	100

(Source: Primary Data)

The table 1.1 describes that 1.6% of the respondents are below 18 years of age group, 67.2% of the respondents belongs to the age group of 18 years to 24 years, 23% of the respondents belong to the age group of 25 years to 34 years, 8.2% of the respondents belongs to the age group of 35 years and above.

TABLE NO 1.2

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Male	35	57.4
2	Female	26	42.6
Total		31	100

(Source: Primary Data)

The table 1.2 describes that 57.4% are Male respondents and 42.6% are Female respondents.

TABLE NO 1.3

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Higher Secondary	4	6.6
2	Under Graduate	50	82
3	Post Graduate	6	9.8
4	Doctorate	1	1.6
TOTAL		61	100

(Source: Primary Data)

The table 1.3 describes that 6.6 % of the respondents are at the level of Higher Secondary, 82% of the respondents are Under Graduate, 9.8% of the respondents are Post Graduate and 1.6% of the respondents are Other.

TABLE NO 1.4

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Urban	33	54.1
2	Rural	18	29.5
3	Semi-Urban	10	16.4
TOTAL		61	100

(Source: Primary Data)

The table 1.4 describes that 54.1% of the respondents belongs to rural area, 29.5% of the respondents belongs to urban area and 16.4% of the respondents belongs to Semi-urban area.

TABLE NO 1.5

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Yes	44	72.1
2	No	16	26.2
3	Maybe	1	1.6
TOTAL		61	100

The table 1.5 describes that 72.1% of the respondents Contributed to a Crowdfunding, 26.2% of the respondents Not contributed to a Crowdfunding, 1.6% of the respondents May or May not contributed to a Crowdfunding.

TABLE NO 1.6

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Yes	58	95.1
2	NO	3	4.9
TOTAL		61	100

The table 1.6 describes that 95.1% of the respondent's they believe crowdfunding can be an effective way to support innovative projects, 4.9% of the respondent's they not believe crowdfunding can be an effective way to support innovative projects.

TABLE NO 1.7

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Creative projects (e.g., art, film, music)	34	29.55
2	Technological innovations	38	33.05
3	Social causes (e.g., charity, community development)	25	21.75
4	Business startups	15	13.05
5	Product launches	3	2.6
TOTAL		115	100

The table 1.7 describes that 29.55% of the respondents Aware in Creative projects, 33.05% of the respondents Aware in Technological innovations, 21.75% of the respondents Aware in Social causes, 13.05% of the respondents Aware in Business startups and 2.6% of the respondents are Aware in Product launches.

TABLE NO 1.8

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDNTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Daily	14	23
2	Weekly	6	9.8
3	Monthly	12	19.7
4	Rarely	26	42.6
5	Never	3	4.9
TOTAL		61	100

The table 1.8 describes that 23% of the respondents are Daily often across crowdfunding campaigns, 9.8% of the respondents are Weekly often across crowdfunding campaigns, 19.7% of the respondents are Monthly often across crowdfunding campaigns, 42.6% of the respondents are Rarely often across crowdfunding campaigns and 4.9% of the respondents are Never often across crowdfunding campaigns.

TABLE NO 1.9

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Kickstarter	26	28.88
2	Indiegogo	23	25.55
3	GoFundMe	30	33.35
4	Patreon	7	7.79
5	Other	4	4.3
TOTAL		90	100

The table 1.9 describes that 28.88% of the respondents are using Kickstarter Crowdfunding Platforms, 25.55% of the respondents are using Indiegogo Crowdfunding Platforms, 33.35% of the respondents are using GoFundMe Crowdfunding Platforms, 7.79% of the respondents are using Patreon Crowdfunding Platforms and 4.4% of the respondents are using Other Crowdfunding Platforms.

TABLE NO 1.10

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Social media	34	39.96
2	Crowdfunding platforms	17	20.01
3	Word of mouth	22	25.90
4	News articles/blogs	12	14.13
TOTAL		85	100

The table 1.10 describes that 39.96% of the respondents are used Social media to Discover Crowdfunding, 20.01% of the respondents are used Crowdfunding platforms to Discover Crowdfunding, 25.90% of the respondents are used Word of mouth to Discover Crowdfunding and 14.13% of the respondents are used News articles/blogs to Discover Crowdfunding.

TABLE NO 1.11

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Yes	57	93.4
2	No	4	6.6
TOTAL			100

The table 1.11 describes that 93.4% of the respondents are Saying that Crowdfunding Promotes conscious Marketing awareness, 6.6% of the respondents are Saying that Crowdfunding Not Promotes Conscious Marketing awareness.

TABLE NO 1.12

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Emphasis on environmental impact	27	27.56
2	Ethical sourcing practices	32	32.66
3	Social responsibility initiatives	33	33.66
4	Transparent communication about project goals and outcomes	6	6.12
TOTAL		98	100

The table 1.12 describes that 27.56% of the respondents are these campaigns resonate with the most Emphasis on environmental impact, 32.66% of the respondents are these campaigns resonate with the most Ethical sourcing practices, 33.66% of the respondents are these campaigns resonate with the most social responsibility initiatives, 6.12% of the respondents are these campaigns resonate with the most Transparent communication about project goals and outcomes.

TABLE NO 1.13

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Lack of trust in project creators	37	37.74
2	Concerns about project viability and delivery	28	28.54
3	Uncertainty about the rewards/offers	17	17.35
4	Limited financial resources	12	12.25
5	Lack of awareness about crowdfunding opportunities	4	4.2
TOTAL		98	100

The table 1.13 describes that 37.74% of the respondents are Lack of trust in project creators comes to participating in crowdfunding, 28.54% of the respondents are Concerns about project viability and delivery comes to participating in crowdfunding, 17.35% of the respondents are Uncertainty about the rewards/offers comes to participating in crowdfunding, 12.25% of the respondents are Limited financial resources comes to participating in crowdfunding, 4.2% of the respondents are Lack of awareness about crowdfunding opportunities comes to participating in crowdfunding.

TABLE NO 1.14

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE (%)
1	Access to funding without traditional financial institutions	30	36.17
2	Ability to gauge market interest and validate ideas	28	33.75
3	Opportunity for direct engagement with backers/supporters	18	21.69
4	Flexibility in project development and execution	6	7.4
5	Other	1	1.17
TOTAL		83	100

The table 1.14 describes Benefits that 36.17% of the respondents are Access to funding without traditional financial institutions, 33.75% of the respondents are Ability to gauge market interest and validate ideas, 21.69% of the respondents are Opportunity for direct engagement with backers/supporters, 7.4% of the respondents are Flexibility in project development and execution, 1.17% of the respondents are have Other Specific Benefits.

2. Likert Scale Analysis:

- 4 = Very High
- 3 = High
- 2 = Low
- 1 = Very Low

- 5= Extremely
- 4= Like
- 3= Neutral
- 2= Unlikely
- 1= Very unlikely

Formula:

$$\text{Likert Scale} = \frac{\sum f(x)}{\text{Total Number of Respondents}}$$

While,

f = Number of respondents

x = Likert scale value

$\sum f(x)$ = Total score

Mid Value:

Mid value indicates the middle most value of Likert scale.

Based on the Likert Scale Analysis we have the following findings:

Table No 2.1 Table

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	LINKERT SCALE (X)	TOTAL (FX)
1	Very familiar	23	4	92
2	Somewhat familiar	35	3	105
3	Not very familiar	3	2	6
4	Not familiar at all	0	1	0
TOTAL		61		203

(Source: Primary Data)

Linkert scale value 3.32 is higher than the middle value (2.5), so the respondents are somewhat familiar with the Concept of Crowdfunding.

TABLE NO 2.2

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	LINKERT SCALE (X)	TOTAL (FX)
1	Extremely influential	18	5	90
2	Very influential	29	4	116
3	Somewhat influential	11	3	33
4	Not very influential	3	2	6
5	Not influential at all	0	1	0
TOTAL		61		245

(Source: Primary Data)

Linkert scale value 4.01 is higher than the middle value (3), so the respondents are very influential in crowdfunding has been promoting innovative and socially conscious projects.

TABLE NO 2.3

S.NO	PARTICULARS	NO. OF RESPONDENTS	LINKERT SCALE (X)	TOTAL (FX)
1	Very likely	20	5	100
2	Likely	23	4	92
3	Neutral	18	3	54
4	Unlikely	0	2	0
5	Very Unlikely	0	1	0
TOTAL		61		246

Linkert scale value 4.03 is higher than the middle value (3), so the respondents are likely to crowdfund in campaign that promotes conscious marketing awareness.

3. Rank Correlation:

Based on the Likert Scale Analysis we have the following findings:

R – Stands for Ranking.

TABLE NO 3.1

FACTORS	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	TOTAL	RANK
Performance Expectancy	42 (5)	4 (4)	4 (3)	6 (2)	5 (1)	255	1
Effort Expectancy	7 (5)	30 (4)	17 (3)	7 (2)	0 (1)	206	2
Social Influence	5 (5)	13 (4)	34 (3)	7 (2)	2 (1)	195	3
Facilitating Condition	4 (5)	7 (4)	5 (3)	37 (2)	8 (1)	145	4
Hedonic Motivation	3 (5)	7 (4)	1 (3)	4 (2)	46 (1)	100	5

(Source: Primary Data)

In the table 3.1, it is understood that Performance Expectancy is ranked as 1, Effort Expectancy is ranked as 2, Social Influence is ranked as 3, Facilitating Condition is ranked as 4, Hedonic Motivation is ranked as 5.

TABLE NO 3.2

FACTORS	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	TOTAL	RANK
Clear and compelling project descriptions	34 (5)	7 (4)	1 (3)	5 (2)	14 (1)	225	1
Engaging visual content	10 (5)	31 (4)	8 (3)	10 (2)	2 (1)	220	2
Regular updates and communication with sponsors	4 (5)	7 (4)	37 (3)	12 (2)	1 (1)	184	3
Collaborations with influencers or celebrities	7 (5)	11(4)	3 (3)	26 (2)	14 (1)	154	4
Creative marketing strategies	6 (5)	5 (4)	12 (3)	8 (2)	30 (1)	132	5

(Source: Primary Data)

In the table 3.2, it is understood that Clear and compelling project descriptions is ranked as 1, Engaging visual content is ranked as 2, Regular updates and communication with sponsors is ranked as 3, Collaborations with influencers or celebrities is ranked as 4, Creative marketing strategies is ranked as 5.

TABLE NO 3.3

FACTORS	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	TOTAL	RANK
Trust in the project creator	33 (5)	8 (4)	8 (3)	5 (2)	7 (1)	238	1
Transparency about project's goals and progress	14 (5)	30 (4)	9 (3)	7 (2)	1 (1)	232	2
Personal alignment with the project's value	4 (5)	13 (4)	31 (3)	10 (2)	3 (1)	188	3
Opportunity for involvement	5 (5)	3 (4)	10 (3)	29 (2)	14 (1)	139	4
Time sensitivity of the campaign's goal	5 (5)	7 (4)	3 (3)	10 (2)	36 (1)	118	5

(Source: Primary Data)

In the table 4.3.3, it is understood that Trust in the project creator is ranked as 1, Transparency about project's goals and progress is ranked as 2, Personal alignment with the project's value is ranked as 3, Opportunity for involvement is ranked as 4, Time sensitivity of the campaign's goal is ranked as 5.

VI. FINDINGS

1. Percentage Analysis

- 67.2% of the respondents belong to the age group of 18 to 24 years.
- 57.4% of the respondents are Male.
- 82% of the respondents are at the Under Graduate.
- 54.1% of the respondents are Urban.
- 72.1% of the respondents Contributed to a Crowdfunding.
- 95.1% of the respondent's they believe crowdfunding is effective way to support innovative projects.
- 55.7% of the respondents are attended an event or webinar related to crowdfunding.
- 33.05% of the respondents are Aware in Technological innovations.
- 42.6% of the respondents are Rarely often across crowdfunding campaigns.
- 33.35% of the respondents use GoFundMe Crowdfunding Platforms.
- 39.96% of the respondents are used social media to Discover Crowdfunding.
- 93.4% of the respondents are Saying Crowdfunding Promotes Marketing awareness.
- 33.66% of the respondents are these campaigns resonate with the most social responsibility initiatives.
- 37.74% of the respondents are Lack of trust in project creators comes to participating in crowdfunding.
- 36.17% of the respondents are Access to funding without traditional financial institutions.

2. Likert Scale Analysis

- The respondents are satisfied on the level of Familiar with the Concept of Crowdfunding.
- The respondents are influential crowdfunding has been promoting innovative and socially conscious projects.
- The respondents are like crowdfunding campaign that promotes conscious marketing awareness.

3. Rank Correlation

- Majority of the respondents ranked 1 for Generative AI based on Awareness by responders.

VII. SUGGESTIONS

To make crowdfunding better, teach people more about it, make the technology easier to use, and be more open about how things work. Work with banks to offer different ways to get money for projects, and use social media to tell more people about crowdfunding. Support projects that care about making the world better. These steps can help more people join in and support crowdfunding.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The data underscores a significant youth demographic engagement in crowdfunding, particularly among 18 to 24-year-olds, predominantly male. Urban areas emerge as hotspots for participation, indicating accessibility and awareness as key factors. While there's widespread belief in crowdfunding's efficacy for supporting innovative projects, challenges persist, including trust issues and barriers to accessing funding without traditional institutions. Social media and platforms like GoFundMe play pivotal roles in campaign discovery. Targeted education on technology and transparency measures can address gaps in awareness and trust, ultimately enhancing participation. Moreover, promoting socially conscious campaigns can amplify the platform's societal impact, aligning with the values of the increasingly socially conscious demographic.

IX. REFERENCES

Journals

1. "Crowdfunding Industry Report" Crowdsourcing.org 2012 Available from www.crowdfunding.nl/wpcontent/uploads/2012/05/92834651-Massolution-abridged-Crowd-Funding-Industry.Report1.pdf
2. Goran Calic & Elaine Mosakowski "Kicking Off Social Entrepreneurship: How A Sustainability Orientation Influences Crowdfunding Success" <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301728535>.
3. Silvio Vismara (2018). "Sustainability in Equity Crowdfunding" <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326527390>
4. Testa, S., Nielsen, (2019). "The Role of Crowdfunding in Moving towards a Sustainable Society" Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 141,66-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.12.011>
5. N G Filimonova et al (2019). "Crowdfunding as the way of projects financing in agribusiness" IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci. 315 022098
6. Myung Ja Kim & C. Michael Hall (2020). "Do value-attitude-behavior and personality affect sustainability crowdfunding initiatives?" <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jenvman>
7. Maehle, N. (2020), "Sustainable crowdfunding: insights from the project perspective", Baltic Journal of Management, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 281-302. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM02-2019-0079>
8. Tingting Fan & Leilei Gao (2020): "The Small Predicts Large Effect in Crowdfunding". journals Vol. 47, 2020 DOI: 10.1093/jcr/ucaa013
9. Yang Xua, Wen Song - International Journal Of Production Research 2021, VOL. 59, NO. 23, 7037–7056 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2020.1832277>
10. Bonnie Simpson, Martin Schreier - Journal of Marketing Research 2021, Vol. 58(2) 363-376 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/0022243720970445
11. Koren M. Jo1 and Shuo Yang - Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance 2021, Vol. 36(4) 723–749 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/0148558X20912100
12. Michael Wessel & Rob Gleasure - Journal of Management Information Systems 2021, Vol.38, NO.3, 612–646 <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2021.1987622>
13. Chen Zhou , Manpreet Gill - Journal of Marketing Research 2022, Vol 59(1) 97-117 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/00222437211033536
14. Kelly B. Herd, Girish Mallapragada - Journal of Marketing 2022, Vol. 86(5) 117-134 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/00222429211031814
15. Paulami Mitra And Frank Janssen - Entrepreneurship And Regional Development 2022, Vol. 34, Nos. 9–10,1001–1024 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2022.2108904>
16. Xuechen Luo & Ling Ge - MIS Quarterly Vol. 46 No. 1 pp. 373-400 / March 2022 DOI:10.25300/MISQ/2022/15406
17. Yanhao Max Wei, Jihoon Hong - Journal of Marketing 2022, Vol. 86(2) 87-104 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/00222429211005481
18. Mingfeng Lin & Richard W. Sias - MIS Quarterly Vol. 47 No. 1 pp. 97-126 / March 2023 DOI:10.25300/MISQ/2022/17321
19. Sofia Bapna & Martin Ganco - MIS Quarterly Vol. 47 No. 2 pp. 585-610 / June 2023 DOI:10.25300/MISQ/2022/17006
20. Sunghan Ryu & Keongtae Kim - MIS Quarterly Vol. 47 No. 3 pp. 1271-1302 / September 2023 DOI:10.25300/MISQ/2022/16620