

[01019] FINANCING LOCAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH CROWDFUNDING: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL PROJECTS IN PORTUGAL

Susana Bernardino¹, J. Freitas Santos², J. Cadima Ribeiro³

¹ Politécnico do Porto, ISCAP/CECEJ, Porto, Portugal, susanab@iscap.ipp.pt

² Politécnico do Porto, ISCAP/CECEJ/ Universidade do Minho, EEG/NIPE, Braga, Portugal, jfsantos@iscap.ipp.pt

ABSTRACT

Crowdfunding (CF) is an increasingly attractive source to fund social projects. However, to our best knowledge, the study of CF for social purposes has remained largely unexplored in the literature. This research envisages a detailed examination of the role of CF on the early-stage of the social projects at regional level. By comparing the characteristics of the projects available in the Portuguese Social Stock Exchange (PSSE) platform with others that did not use this source of financial support, we explore its role on regional development. The results we got show that, in most cases, both PSSE and Non-Governmental Organizations projects complemented the services offered by the State or by the private sector. Furthermore, about a quarter of the projects present in PSSE operated in areas that were not being addressed neither by the services offered by the State nor by the ones of the private sector. The results attained show that more recent social ventures have a greater propensity to use PSSE. The same is found in those organizations which work closely with the target audience. We also observed that the use of PSSE was correlated with the geographical scope of the Social Venture. The circumstance of having the social organization acting at a local or regional level seems to be strongly associated with the possibility of using social crowdfunding for financing social projects.

Keywords: Crowdfunding, regional development, regional policy, social crowdfunding, social entrepreneurship.

FINANCIAMENTO DO DESENVOLVIMENTO REGIONAL ATRAVÉS DO CROWDFUNDING: UMA ANÁLISE EMPÍRICA DOS PROJETOS SOCIAIS EM PORTUGAL

RESUMO

O *crowdfunding* (CF) é uma fonte de financiamento de projetos sociais com atratividade crescente. Contudo, de acordo com o nosso melhor conhecimento, o estudo do CF com propósitos sociais permanece ainda muito pouco explorado na literatura. Esta investigação realiza uma análise detalhada do papel do CF em novos projetos sociais de nível regional. Através da comparação das características dos projetos disponíveis na plataforma da Bolsa de Valores Sociais Portuguesa (PSSE) com outros projetos que não usam esta fonte de financiamento, explora-se o seu contributo para o desenvolvimento regional. Os resultados obtidos indicam que, na maioria dos casos, quer os projetos cotados na PSSE quer os projetos desenvolvidos por Organizações Não-governamentais para o Desenvolvimento complementam os serviços disponibilizados pelo Estado ou pelo setor empresarial. Acresce que cerca de um quarto dos projetos presentes na PSSE opera em áreas em que não está a ser contemplada pelos setores público e privado. Os resultados alcançados revelam que as iniciativas sociais mais recentes apresentam uma maior propensão para recorrer à PSSE. O mesmo resultado é obtido em organizações que trabalham de uma forma mais proximamente do seu público-alvo. A investigação revela ainda que o uso da PSSE se encontra correlacionada com o âmbito geográfico da organização social. O facto de a organização social atuar a nível local ou regional parece estar fortemente associado à possibilidade de se usar o *crowdfunding* social como forma de financiamento de projetos sociais.

Palavras-chave: Crowdfunding, crowdfunding social, desenvolvimento regional, empreendedorismo social, política regional.

1. INTRODUCTION

The term crowdsourcing (CS) is frequently used as a convenient label for a diverse range of activities and projects involving the public participation. It is a concept based on business and production that was coined in 2006 by Jeff Howe in the article “the rise of crowdsourcing” (Oomen, Gligorov & Hildebrand, 2014; Ridge, 2014). The idea behind the concept derives from the application of open source principles to fields outside the software industry.

Crowdsourcing in social entrepreneurship (SE) benefits from its ability to draw upon the notion of common social causes in invitations to participate, and this may explain why projects generally follow collaborative and cooperative, rather than competitive models. Hence, the term CF derives from the concept of crowdsourcing and could be characterized as the collective cooperation of people who pool their money and other resources together to support efforts initiated by others.

In the digital world, social CF can be defined as an open call for raising funds, essentially through the internet, in the form of donation or in exchange for some sort of reward in order to support initiatives for social goals (Ridge, 2014;

Tomczak & Brem, 2013). The ability of digital technologies to provide almost instantaneous data gathering and feedback, computationally validate contributions and the ability to reach both broad and niche groups through loose networks have all been particularly important in different situations (Ridge, 2014).

The study of social CF in the digital world and its role on regional development has remained largely unexplored in the literature, specifically through Social Stock Exchange platforms. Lehner (2013) reinforces this assertion claiming for a more rigorous and robust conceptual and empirical research to address and inform policy makers and practitioners likewise in order to increase the success of CF of new (social) ventures.

The main goal of this research is to gain deeper knowledge on the use of CF for social purposes and examine its role on the support of social projects that contribute to the development of local communities, that is, the study takes an exploratory approach to understand whether this new financial instrument has been used at local or regional level by social entrepreneurs. To attain this objective, we examine the main characteristics of the social projects available on the Portuguese Social Stock Exchange (PSSE) platform and contrast them with other social projects financed by other sources. Doing this, we aim to display the main differences in the background of the projects' promoters, and scrutinize the regional orientation of the projects. By exploring these issues, we hope to enhance the body of knowledge on social entrepreneurship and regional policy and make practical contributions for social entrepreneurs, policy makers and the managers of similar platforms.

This paper is organized into several sections. The next section emphasizes the role of social entrepreneurship, regional policy and social CF platforms as a source of financial support for social ventures (SV). Section 2 contains a short literature review on CF for social purposes. Section 3 outlines the methodological aspects concerning sampling and data collection. Section 4 elaborates on the statistical analysis and discusses the findings of the study. The conclusion section provides a summary of the paper, explores policy implications and presents the limitations of the study.

2. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP, REGIONAL POLICY AND PORTUGUESE SOCIAL STOCK EXCHANGE

2.1 Social entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship has its origins in the entrepreneurs' spirit and in the way they face social issues, by searching for an innovative way to address permanent social necessities for which classic mechanisms show serious difficulties in providing solutions. Therefore, social entrepreneurs have a key role to play in identifying social problems and developing new ways to help solving different sort of social problems.

Social entrepreneurship has been recognized as a helpful instrument of social and economic policy, particularly when dealing with unemployment, social exclusion and sustainable regional and local economic development (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004; Borzaga & Galera, 2012; Friedman & Desivilya, 2010; Lambrou, 2012; Parente, Barbosa & Vilhena, 2012; Quintão, 2004).

The European Commission (EU) (European Communities, 2011) recognised very early the importance of social organisations in economic growth and social innovation, through the contribution of such organisations to the development of societies endowed with higher levels of democracy, activism and social cohesion. Azmat (2013) and Feld (2012) recognize the potential of social entrepreneurship to attenuate the more persistent social problems and to promote wealth in communities and societies through innovative strategies and creative solutions. According to the authors, social entrepreneurs usually adopt innovative approaches with the potential to take a positive and critical role in poverty reduction and to help with the promotion of sustainable growth in developing countries. Likewise, Yiu, Wan, Ng, Chen and Su (2014) argue that social entrepreneurship plays an important role in the community development of emerging economies, and Nega and Schneider (2014) highlight the significant role of social entrepreneurship in economic development. For McAnany (2012), social entrepreneurship has a great potential to contribute to: (i) social change; (ii) the development of local communities; (iii) the enhancement of economic growth; (iv) poverty reduction; and (v) environmental sustainability.

Social entrepreneurship could promote structural adjustments and economic revitalization by launching extensive new services for disadvantaged communities. However, not all communities affected by social problems offer the same potential to capture resources (human, financial, physical) to satisfy the community needs.

Social entrepreneurial activities are driven by individuals although they are heavily influenced by the environment, which comprises all the external influences that affect the entrepreneur's behaviour and performance (Cajaiba-Santana, 2010; Covin & Slevin, 1991; Mair, 2010; Welter, 2011). Environmental influences can be classified as economic, technological, demographic, social, cultural, and governmental/institutional (Hill & Jones, 2013). Indeed, SV are not developed in a vacuum (CASE, 2008) but are constrained by a particular environment (Weerawardena & Mort, 2006).

As stated by Katz and Kahn (1966) in the open system theory, the emergence of organizations (mainly private companies) derives from the interaction between agents and environment, which suggest a strong influence of the environment on the creation of organizations. The same applies to social entrepreneurship, as the environmental forces could incite or deter the launching of new SV (Mair, 2010; Urbano & Ferri, 2011; Ziegler, 2009).

Social problems are increasing complex and interlocking even in local communities. The idea that a social entrepreneur can design and implement a solution for a local problem without financial support is misleading. A social project to grow depends both on government and the existing network of stakeholders for financing the local initiatives. However, with the recent economic crisis social entrepreneurs are struggling with their most difficult challenges in the past half-century. Therefore, new instruments for finance regional and local development policies are needed and can be adopted by public and private organizations.

2.2 Regional policy

Today's challenges have taken an increasingly social (Hoogendoorn & Hartog, 2011) and territorial (Rocha-Trindade, 1996; Silva & Cadima Ribeiro, 2014) dimensions. Nonetheless, the social problems tend to be felt differently from region to region (Cherodian & Thirlwall, 2013; Polèse, 1998; Souziadis & Antunes, 2006). This reality has to do with resources endowment, with productive specialization but, in most of the cases, with regions' capabilities, including leadership and entrepreneurial initiative. As underlined by Kuznets (1973), long ago, in what concerns development, not everything is explained on the basis of resources endowment. In a much more recent paper, Cherodian and Thirlwall (2013), among others, have subscribed this idea.

Having that in mind, the search for new solutions to social and territorial problems have to rely on innovative instruments. In what regards regional development, the endogenous resources and capabilities of territories are critical (Cherodian & Thirlwall, 2013; Dallabrida, 2010; Krugman, 1998; Maillat, 2002; Romer, 1986; Vazquez Barquero, 2006).

One of the most enduring societal challenges, no matter if we are following a macroeconomic or a regional approach, is the fight against unemployment. This phenomenon is often linked to increased crime and social exclusion, with long-lasting consequences not only for those losing their jobs, but also for their children, who have fewer opportunities in society (European Communities, 2011). Rural and peripheral populations tend to feel the problems of unemployment and social exclusion more deeply (Krugman, 1998; Polèse, 1998; Rocha-Trindade, 1996; Silva & Cadima Ribeiro, 2014).

In times of economic and financial crisis, public and private institutions have scarce financial resources to commit to social causes or to be more selective when applying their funds (Acs, 2010; Hoogendoorn & Hartog, 2011; Karlsson, Johansson & Stough, 2010). In such a context, policy makers can play a strategic role in fostering social entrepreneurship by functioning as catalysts by simplifying the legislative environment and develop policy initiatives (taxation) that support the accomplishment of social organizations' mission. That is, even if public money is scarcer, solutions (policies) are available or must be find to deal with the difficulties faced by deprived social groups and depressed territories.

Financial resources are vital for starting new social ventures (De Clercq *et al.*, 2013), as the level of financial system development within a nation is highly consequential to entrepreneurial activity (Levie & Autio, 2008). A highly developed financial system frequently includes financial institutions, which helps the access of new social entrepreneurs to financial resources.

To finance the social venture borrowing funds from individual donors and social responsible firms may be inadequate. New financial mechanisms, such as crowdfunding, could be used to provide funds more freely than in systems where financial capital is often provided by banks and at higher interest rates. In such cases, the cost of forming a new social venture may be prohibitive. Thus, in societies in which financial capital is more accessible and affordably available to new social ventures from informal investors or advanced financial mechanisms new social ventures will be more likely to flourish (Whitley, 1999).

The social entrepreneurs' access to finance at the early-stage of the social project might be very demanding. According to the World Bank (2013) social CF is a powerful force for change that can generate opportunities to fund social projects.

As noted earlier, social entrepreneurs can have difficulties to fund social projects due to factors such as a lack of a 'track record', which make the cost of agreeing finance for relatively small amounts of extremely high or of a higher perceived risk in investing in social institutions that depend most exclusively on the state (Gajda & Walton, 2013).

The government financial support can be crucial for running a social organization in times of increased pressure to respond to local problems (Mitra, 2012; Shockley & Frank, 2011). In addition, the provision of a wide range of training, information and advice could assist potential or existing social entrepreneurs to improve learning and

developing their managerial skills. Courses on issues such as regulations (taxation), management practices (marketing, strategy, human resources, logistics, motivation, leadership) and technical training could be useful to assist social entrepreneurs on the everyday tasks. In this regard, following Naghiu, Vázquez and Geogiev (2005), one must keep in mind that a set of historical, cultural, education and organizational factors will always determine the capability of the actors of a certain territory to generate and accept social change on the several ways it can show up. Thus, some of the external stimulus already mentioned might be required in order to promote social entrepreneurship.

One must be aware that a strong start-up infrastructure (buildings, logistics system, etc.) is imperative even for social entrepreneurs. In any case, we assume that, besides for general infrastructures, resources can be gathered from the community via social entrepreneurs or crowdfunding. To attain this objective, based on the perceived value for the local community, a strong appeal must be made by the social entrepreneur to the solidarity and generosity of the internal and external community, namely, to those who keep an affective relationship with the community and the territory where the social venture will be implemented. Exploring this affective link is surely rewarding as can be seen when people have to deal with dramatic events (natural disasters, terrorism, refugees, etc.) that take place somewhere all over the world and are public through the news of the traditional media (Press, TV, etc.) and the various social media (Facebook, Twitter, You Tube, etc.).

Social entrepreneurship can also act as a force for regional development through improving access to and support for developing new technologies. Cooperation of social institutions with universities and government research agencies should promote technology transfer in order to develop new products or services for disadvantaged people (Berzin, Pitt-Catsoules & Peterson, 2014). Resources and local know-how, together with scientific knowledge, might provide sustainable solutions for social and regional problems no matter their complexity (Freitas Santos & Cadima Ribeiro, 2005). The social mission of universities equally matches with this kind of demand but, often, social actors and territories are not able to establish a sustainable relation of cooperation between the different actors.

The continuous scan of social problems in the society and the search of new responses according to the available resources are synonymous of an entrepreneurial culture. An entrepreneurial culture in terms of behavior (team work, leadership) and a more positive attitude towards social problems should improve social and civic entrepreneurship. Such a culture is needed in certain territories and circumstances and can be disseminated through the practice of systematic social innovation, education and role models (Naghiu *et al.*, 2005). A general commitment towards the development of this culture should be pursued by the agents of change, with the stimulus of the government.

2.3 Portuguese Social Stock Exchange

The Social Stock Exchange model was adopted by the United Nations as a case study and recommended as an exemplary case to be followed by other stock exchanges, also receiving the UNESCO endorsement (Grecco, 2010). The Portuguese Social Stock Exchange (PSSE) was created in 2009 as a social initiative that aims to reproduce, with some adaptations, the environment of a conventional stock exchange. The main objective is to mobilize resources for promising new SV.

Despite the similarities, the PSSE is slightly different from a traditional stock exchange, since the concept of a social investor (used for individuals or entities that provide funds to the projects) corresponds to a donor. Likewise, following the logic of capital markets, social shares represent the unit of donation established by the PSSE (1 euro each). The owners of the projects may issue shares that can be acquired by potential investors in order to generate funds for the social venture.

At present, projects listed on the PSSE do not have a 'price' like their counterparts in the conventional stock exchanges. However, PSSE promotes the visibility of the selected projects, leverages the resources available for the project and facilitates the contact between donors (social investors) and civil society organizations with relevant work in the fields of education and social entrepreneurship.

In Portugal, projects carried out by nonprofit Portuguese civil society organizations are eligible to apply for the social stock exchange. The selection of projects is made by a specialized technical team, and the criteria for assessing these projects are, among others, the objectives of the project, its innovative nature, its scalability and replicability, the expected social impact and its technical and financial viability. Through the PSSE website (www.bvs.org.pt), the persons (or entities) interested in investing in social causes can access a brief description of projects that need funding. There are two thematic investment funds, one in the area of education and the other in the area of social entrepreneurship. The PSSE currently has 26 projects, 8 of which have gathered all of the necessary funding.

The existence of a mediator (PSSE), which tries to adjust the demand for grants with the projects of social entrepreneurs, increases the transparency and scrutiny of the whole process. These projects require a strong commitment in terms of their governance and accountability. Social investors may follow the projects and evaluate the social impact through the analysis of reports published in the website of the PSSE.

3. CROWDFUNING AND SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: A LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature of the social CF focusing on alternative sources of donation based financing (traditional vs. social CF) is scarce (Belleflamme, Lambert & Schwienbacher, 2014; Mollick, 2014). Likewise, to our best knowledge, the analysis of the regional impact of CF platforms on financing social projects *vis a vis* the traditional donation model does not exist. In the absence of a specific framework we adapt the current literature on the process of choosing the best alternative forms of CF financing to the social entrepreneur's (capital seekers) perspective. Lehner (2013) advocates the convergence between the CF and the social entrepreneurship.

Traditionally, government subsidies and private altruistic donations are the main sources of financing for the social sector. Due to the increased number of social organizations and the need of the European countries to reduce their deficits, the social sector has experienced some difficulties in gaining access to traditional private funding (pension funds, private banks, risk capital) when trying to launch their activities. The main reasons are peculiar to the social sector as the financial instruments are not designed for organizations with the aims, size, form of governance and legal status that are intrinsic to the social sector (Guézennec & Malochet, 2013). First, because the aims are not to maximize the return on investment of the social projects but generally pay the lending. Also, because the perception of high risk associated with social projects is enough to deter potential investors whose aversion to risk has been significantly reinforced by the financial and economic crisis. Such a perception can be explained by both the very nature of the activities in the social sector, aimed at the most vulnerable and least solvent section of society, and by the ignorance of potential investors concerning the sector. Thus, in the eyes of the classical investor, there is a lack of credibility, a lack of conviction in the projects' viability, and very often a lack of guarantees. The small and medium size of social organizations is another element that constrains the access to private funding as initial funding requirements are often considered costly to be interesting to private investors. Finally, the legal status of social organizations can also be a deterrent on accessing private funding, as most of the status excludes the possibility of remunerating the investors (Guézennec & Malochet, 2013).

New ideas that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations are needed for social and regional development. They are innovations that are not only good for society but also enhance society's capacity to act" (European Communities, 2011, p. 9). These innovations usually happen by trial and error, learning-by-doing, and exchanging ideas within groups where exchange of opinions assures new ways of functioning. The CF platforms for social purposes or social CF combine the latest developments of the digital economy with technologies and finance that could be an innovative response to problems and needs of social entrepreneurs.

Most of the CF projects are based on the lending model in which funds are offered as a loan, with the expectation of some rate of return on capital invested (Schwienbacher & Larralde, 2012; Belleflamme *et al.*, 2014). Social CF efforts, such as humanitarian projects, follow a patronage model, placing funders in the position of philanthropists, who expect no direct return for their contributions (OECD, 2014). The patronage model is donation-based and materializes when a crowdfunder (the giver) receives no-rewards for his funding besides altruism, generosity or personal and corporate promotion (Mollick, 2014). It can not only provide necessary funds for social projects, but may also lead to a higher legitimacy of these through early societal interaction and participation (Lehner & Nicholls, 2014). According to Gajda and Walton (2013) the difference between donation-based CF and traditional fundraising is that social entrepreneurs can use the social CF platform to collect and ear-marked donations for a dedicated project. This could help raise higher amounts per donor, because funders know that their money will be used on a specific project. Such donors also tend to give recurring donations if the social organization keeps them updated about the progress of the project. Social CF is most applicable to community-related projects and microfinance to micro development (World Bank, 2013).

There are three important topics on the study of CF that are relevant for the present study and the statement of the research questions. One is to demonstrate "how do entrepreneurs that use traditional donations based financing instruments differ in demographics from those that use the social CF platforms"? The second is to understand "what is the relative impact of social projects characteristics on the alternative forms of donations based financing (traditional vs. social CF)"? Finally, determine "what is the contribution of social CF for regional development"?

There are different motivations for social entrepreneurs to choose a CF platform for financing their projects (Moritz & Block, 2014). The first is obviously to receive funding from the donors to attenuate a particular problem by displaying the main characteristics of the projects and the managerial structural schemes of support (such as a social organization) for efficiency and sustainability (Belleflamme *et al.*, 2014). This is important because it offers the possibility to obtain funds for the early-stage-gap of the project when conservative funding is not possible. Another motivation could be raising awareness as well as feedback on the project (Bouncken, Komorek & Kraus, 2015).

Projects with a social or non-profit oriented background have a higher probability of receiving funding from the crowd (Moritz & Block, 2014). This relationship has been confirmed both theoretically and empirically (Belleflamme *et al.*, 2013, 2014). According to these authors, the non-profit organizations have a higher credibility in the realization of the project, in contrast to profit-oriented organizations.

Also, the characteristics of the entrepreneur influence the chance for a project to be successfully fund, while investors contribute to projects they want to see it realized (Belleflamme *et al.*, 2013; Moritz & Block, 2014). Therefore, non-profit organizations or socially focused companies are more likely to be supported by investors than others (Bouncken *et al.*, 2015).

Mollick (2014) suggests that geography may play an important role in the success of CF efforts and has the potential to mitigate many of the distance effects found in traditional fundraising efforts. Therefore, we can consider a home bias effect that could be explained by an emotional and cultural preference for local projects that could attract donors from different regions in a country.

4. METHODOLOGY

On the basis of the literature review, a draft questionnaire was prepared that included the questions judge to have importance in answering the research questions. The pretest of the questionnaire was made using the contributions of ten experts on the field. The final version of the questionnaire reflected a few modifications suggested by the participants.

Our sampling frame consisted of a random sample of 99 of the 151 social projects listed in the directory of the Portuguese Institute for Development Assistance (IPAD-Instituto Português de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento) that meet the criteria of Non-governmental organizations (NGO) and were not hold by religious, political or other business entities. To this sample we added all the projects (29) listed on the Portuguese Social Stock Exchange (PSSE). For each selected project an email with a link to the Lime Survey platform was sent requesting to complete the questionnaire. The platform was active between September 9th, 2012 and January 3rd, 2013. After multiple follow-up emails and phone calls, 69 useable responses were received on 44 NGOs and 24 PSSE projects, resulting in an overall online response rate of 53.1% (44.4% on NGO and 82.8% on PSSE) well above 33% that was the overall response rate that Nulty (2008, p. 303) found in 8 studies that used online surveys. To estimate the size of the sample we accepted the normality of the distribution (nothing prevent us of accepting that assumption). Then, we defined the level of confidence of 95% (an acceptable level of confidence among the scientific community), took a sampling error of +/-10% (as the variation expected between the finite population and the sampling frame is low) and selected the proportion of the population mean (50%, worst case scenario). Based on the formula for finite population (N=128), the size of the sample estimated was n=55 (Malhotra, 1999, p. 362), while in our study we use in the empirical analysis 68 responses.

The main aim of this research was to gain deeper knowledge on the use of CF for social purposes and to explore its role on regional development. In order to achieve this purpose we attempt to contrast the main characteristics of the social projects available on the PSSE platform with other social projects funded by other financial sources. Taking into account this general goal, we investigated the nature of the social entrepreneurial venture according to the following categorical variables that was introduced into our research model (table 1).

Table 1: Variables included in the research model

Variable	Codification used
SV's characteristics	
Organization type	0- NGOs 1- PSSE projects
Seniority	0 Otherwise 1 ≤ 10 years old
Geographical location	0- Otherwise 1- Lisbon and Oporto area
Geographical scope	0- National or International 1- Local or Regional
Audience target	
Older people	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue

People with physical disabilities and/or special needs	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
People from minority ethnic communities	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
People with particular financial needs	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
Refugees	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
People suffering from addictions	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
Socially excluded/vulnerable people	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
Animals	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
Local organizations and associations	0- Otherwise 1- The SV deals with this social issue
Aims	
To complete services supplied by the markets	0- Otherwise 1- Yes
To complete services supplied by the public sector	0- Otherwise 1- Yes
To compete with other providers	0- Otherwise 1- Yes
To compete with the public sector	0- Otherwise 1- Yes
To perform an activity that is not provided by the public or the private sectors	0- Otherwise 1- Yes

Source: Authors' own elaboration

Thus, through the empirical work we aimed to evaluate the impact of the SV's characteristics in the decision to use a social CF platform, specifically their seniority, geographical location, geographical scope, target audience and aim of the activities developed.

For the statistical analysis of data, we used the chi-square test, a non-parametric test which allows us to evaluate the extent to which two pairs of variables are independent or not (Field, 2005). Taking in account the sample size, we used the likelihood ratio in the implementation of this statistical inference tests (Field, 2005, p.692). Furthermore, we also aimed to measure the strength of the association observed between the variables. For that purpose, Cramer's V statistic was used (Field, 2005, p. 689). Then, based on chi-square approximation, we computed the Goodman and Kruskal λ , in order to measure the extent to which the membership of a category of one variable is able to predict the membership category presented in the other variable. Finally, to make the data analysis more complete and comprehensive, based on the contingency tables previously built, we computed the odds ratio to measure the extent to which the presence of some characteristics of the project is able to foster the use of social CF in Portugal or not.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Sample

The descriptive characteristics of the sample are presented in this section. About half of the responses obtained (48.9%) were completed by the head of the organization and the remainders were fairly evenly distributed between directors, board members, technicians or others. Around half of them (51.1%) worked as volunteers, wherein this percentage was higher in the NGOs case (62.5%) than in PSSE projects (23,1%).

Concerning the SV's characteristics, we observe that most of PSSE projects were 10 or more years old (62.5%), followed by ventures aged between 3 and 10 years (29.2%). Most of NGOs, in turn, were aged between 3 and 10 years old (56.8%), and only a small proportion were also less than 3 years old (6.8%). These results could be justified by the time required by organizations for being aware of the benefits of using social CF platforms and by the time required for taking the steps necessary to access PSSE.

Both PSSE projects and NGOs were mainly located in the greater Lisbon area (58.3% and 50.0%, respectively). The other PSSE projects were geographically distributed by the Portuguese territory, as it can be seen in table 2. Two of them had a simultaneous presence in various geographical locations (8.3%). Most of the projects listed on PSSE had a national (41.7%) and local scope (29.2%), being less frequent the case of projects acting in international (12.5%) or regional levels (16.7%). NGOs, in turn, worked mainly at an international (77.3%) or national level (13.6%), and only a small percentage referred to act regionally (6.8%) or locally (2.3%).

We observe social entrepreneurial ventures cover a wide range of social areas. The most common within PSSE projects are those that dealt with socially excluded and/or vulnerable people (37.5%), people with physical disabilities or special needs (29.2%), elderly people (20.8%) or with people with financial needs (20.8%). Several PSSE projects referred to work with other target audience, such as children (6), young people (2), the whole population (2), potential entrepreneurs (1) and AIDS/HIV infected (1). NGOs also dealt with a great diversity of social issues, where the most frequent were socially excluded people (47.7%), people with financial needs (38.6%), other organizations or associations (38.6%) and elderly people (25.0%).

It should be noted that SE ventures tend to focus their activity on a limited number of social issues, whereas PSSE projects worked, in average, in two of the inquired social areas (average of 1.95) and NGOs between two and three categories (average of 2.4).

With respect to the activities developed, we observe that in most cases both PSSE projects and NGOs complemented the services offered by the State (50.0% and 47.7%, respectively) or by the private sector (41.7% and 25.0%, correspondingly), whereas it is not frequent that they compete with other providers (this occurs in only 12.5% and 13.6% of the cases, respectively). Furthermore, about a quarter of the projects present in PSSE operate in areas that were not being addressed neither by the services offered by the State nor by the private sector (25.0%), being the same verified in more than a third of NGOs (36.4%).

Table 2: General characteristics of the sample

Characteristics	PSSE projects		NGOs		Total	
	N (24)	%	N (44)	%	N (68)	%
Age						
1-3 years	2	8.3%	3	6.8%	5	7.4%
3-10 years	7	29.2%	25	56.8%	32	47.1%
>10 years	15	62.5%	16	36.4%	31	45.6%
Geographical location						
North	2	8.3%	8	18.2%	10	14.7%
Center	2	8.3%	8	18.2%	10	14.7%
Lisbon	14	58.3%	22	50.0%	36	52.9%
Alentejo	3	12.5%	2	4.5%	5	7.4%
Algarve	0	0.0%	1	2.3%	1	1.5%
Islands	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.5%
Various	2	8.3%	3	6.8%	5	7.4%
Geographical scope						
Local	7	29.2%	1	2.3%	8	11.8%
Regional	4	16.7%	3	6.8%	7	10.3%
National	10	41.7%	6	13.6%	16	23.5%
International	3	12.5%	34	77.3%	37	54.4%
Target audience						
Older people	5	20.8%	11	25.0%	16	23.5%
People with physical disabilities and/or special needs	7	29.2%	4	9.1%	11	16.2%
People from minority ethnic communities	4	16.7%	9	20.5%	13	19.1%
People with particular financial needs	5	20.8%	17	38.6%	22	32.4%
Refugees	0	0.0%	6	13.6%	6	8.8%
People suffering from addictions	2	8.3%	2	4.5%	4	5.9%
Socially excluded/vulnerable people	9	37.5%	21	47.7%	30	44.1%
Animals	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Local organizations and associations	4	16.7%	17	38.6%	21	30.9%
Others	11	45.8%	22	50.0%	33	48.5%
Aims						
To complete services supplied by the markets	10	41.7%	11	25.0%	21	30.9%
To complete services supplied by the public sector	12	50.0%	21	47.7%	33	48.5%
To compete with other providers	3	12.5%	4	9.1%	7	10.3%
To compete with the public sector	0	0.0%	2	4.5%	2	2.9%
To perform an activity that is not provided by the public or the private sectors	6	25.0%	16	36.4%	22	32.4%

Source: Authors' own elaboration

5.2 Results

After presenting the general characteristics of the sample, we proceed in this section to a comparative study of the PSSE projects and NGOs characteristics, in order to assess the extent to which different features are able to explain why some SV use social CF platforms, while others only rely on traditional based financing.

The data analysis reveals that SV's seniority degree and the use of the social CF platforms are not independent variables ($\chi^2(1) = 4.3$; $p = 0.038$). Although the capacity to predict if a SV access to PSSE according to its seniority is only about 6.3% (Goodman and Kruskal $\lambda = 0.063$, $p = 0.040$), we observe a moderate association between both variables (Cramer's $V = 0.251$, $p = 0.039$). The analysis of the odds ratio suggest that more recent ventures are 2.9

times more likely to access PSSE than those aged over 10 years. This result could be explained for two reasons: first of all, because social CF is a recent phenomenon and the presence of PSSE is quite recent; secondly, younger ventures are often faced with increased difficulties in accessing financial resources, which could encourage them to be more active in finding new and alternative financing sources.

We also observe that the use of PSSE is conditioned by the geographical scope of the SV ($\chi^2(1) = 11.848$; $p = 0.001$). The fact that the social organization act at a local or regional level is strongly associated with the possibility to use social CF (Cramer's $V = 0.423$, $p < 0.001$) and the consideration of this variable is able to reduce by about 11.9% the probability of error of forecasting if an initiative is or not listed on PSSE (Goodman and Kruskal $\lambda = 0.179$, $p = 0.001$). Our empirical data suggest that local and regional SV are much more likely to use PSSE than those ventures which act at national or international levels (odds ratio = 8.5).

The greatest propensity of these SV to use social CF platforms could be explained by the socio-economic characteristics of the local population they aim to address, which could have scarce resources to support the venture's social mission. The financial constraints experienced by the local population seem requiring SV to get support from a broader audience, expecting that Portuguese citizens interested in contributing to relevant social causes could help financing these projects. Additionally, the "localized" appeal maybe also more able to capture philanthropic attitudes, related to affective relationship with territories and their social structures, as mentioned in the review of literature. NGOs, in turn, due to their size and international action (particularly in developing countries) could possibly have access to other kind of incentive programs, which makes the search of new financing sources not so pressing and, on the other side, eventually, they are less able to make appeal to donors based on affective links.

The statistical results indicate that there is no significant association between geographical location and the kind of SV pursued (table 3). So, according to the empirical evidence gathered, we could reject the possibility of SV located in the Portuguese major urban centers (Lisbon and Oporto) being more prone (or not) to access social CF. The odds ratio suggest that the ventures located in the municipality of Lisbon or Oporto were 0.818 times more likely to be listed on PSSE (or, reversely, SV created out of these main urban centers were 1.22 times more likely to use PSSS). This result is consistent with positive relationship verified between local and regional social initiatives and the use of PSSE. So, crowdfunding does seem to be an instrument endowed with regional development potential, when dealing with socially oriented projects.

Table 3: SV's characteristics and financing mechanisms used

Variables	Likelihood Ratio		Goodman and Kruskal λ		Cramer's V		Odds ratio
	Value	Sig. (2 sided)	Value	Sig.	Value	Sig.	
Seniority	4.300	0.038**	0.063	0.040**	0.251	0.039**	2.917
Geographical location	0.154	0.695	0.002	0.697	0.048	0.695	0.818
Geographical scope	11.848	0.001***	0.179	0.001***	0.423	0.000***	8.462

***. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha = 0.01$; **. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha = 0.05$; *. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha = 0.10$;

Source: Authors' own elaboration

Regarding to the social issue addressed, our analyses shows that in the majority of cases no relationship is observed between the venture's target audience and the kind of social entrepreneurial activity pursued (table 4). The exceptions are observed in organizations that deal with people with physical disabilities and/or special needs ($\chi^2(1) = 4.409$; $p = 0.036$; Cramer's $V = 0.261$, $p = 0.032$), refugees ($\chi^2(1) = 5.536$; $p = 0.019$; Cramer's $V = 0.230$, $p = 0.058$) and with local organizations and associations ($\chi^2(1) = 3.738$; $p = 0.053$; Cramer's $V = 0.227$, $p = 0.006$).

We found that organizations that dealt with people with physical disabilities and/or special needs were about 4.12 times more prone to use PSSE than the other ones, and this fact predicts the membership in the social CF platform approximately in 7% (Goodman and Kruskal $\lambda = 0.068$). The development of activities in this social area could require an additional investment in infrastructure and equipment suitable to the features of the public they intent to serve. Due the fact they are more capital intensive, they have a particular need for obtaining the financial resources required and, therefore, they are more prone to apply to PSSE.

On the other hand, our results suggest that SV that used to work with refugees were less likely to access social CF. In fact, none of the PSSE projects dealt with this issue (which result in an odds ratio=0). Acting on this social problem, reversely, was more common within NGOs, which could be explained by the international cooperation needed to cope with this kind of issues.

Even with respect to the target audience, we observe that PSSE were less likely to deal with other local organizations and associations than NGOs (odds ratio=0.318). In other words, we have observed that social organizations present in PSSE had a greater propensity to work directly with the individuals or families which were affected by a social

problem than NGOs (3.15 times more likely). Thus, we can conclude that NGOs tended to be marginally more concerned with the intervention built through actions developed towards other organizations. This could mean that SV that have a more national or international scope tend to act upon other organizations (with a local nature) in order to implement the response model they had conceived. Thus, their intervention involves the capacity of building and empowering the local communities, as a way of spreading and optimizing the social impact they jointly are able to achieve.

One the other hand, PSSE projects which act mainly in a local or regional way (as previously mentioned), are more predisposed to work directly with the individuals they intend to serve. This result could be justified by the proximity observed between them (SV and final target audience), which is seen as a critical factor to identify and evaluate the problems and to improve efficiency in the actions taken. Once again, physical and affective proximity looks to be a moving factor behind those social initiatives. That is something that boosts their potential and, simultaneously, catalyzes the power for social change.

Table 4: SV's target audience and financing mechanisms used

Variables	Likelihood Ratio		Goodman and Kruskal λ		Cramer's V		Odds ratio
	Value	Asymp. Sig. (2 sided)	Value	Approx. Sig.	Value	Approx. Sig.	
Older people	0.152	0.697	0.002	0.701	0.047	0.699	0.790
People with physical disabilities and/or special needs	4.409	0.036**	0.068	0.033**	0.261	0.032**	4.118
People from minority ethnic communities	0.146	0.702	0.002	0.706	0.046	0.704	0.778
People with particular financial needs	2.344	0.178	0.033	0.137	0.182	0.134	0.418
Refugees	5.536	0.019**	0.053	0.060*	0.230	0.058*	0.000
People suffering from addictions	0.386	0.610	0.006	0.529	0.077	0.526	1.909
Socially excluded/vulnerable people	0.664	0.415	0.010	0.420	0.098	0.417	0.657
Animals	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Local organizations and associations	3.738	0.053*	0.052	0.063*	0.227	0.061*	0.318
Others	0.108	0.742	0.002	0.744	0.040	0.743	0.846

***. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha=0.01$; **. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha=0.05$; *. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha=0.10$;

Source: Authors' own elaboration

With respect to the aims of the activity provided by SV, our results suggest that the level of complementarity or competition with the services provided by other entities (public or private sectors) are not able to explain the access (or not) to the social CF platform (table 5). By analyzing the odds ratio, we observe that it is far more likely that NGOs compete with the work developed by the State than PSSE projects (it should be highlighted that none of the PSSE projects dealt with social problems already addressed by the public initiative). This result, although it lacks statistical significance, could indicate that PSSE projects which have a more local action have a deeper understanding and awareness of the actual needs of its target audience and the extent to which these needs were (or not) being adequately addressed by the existing social responses.

The international action of NGOs, in turn, could result in a greater difficulty in adjusting the intervention built to the answers already existing at the different spheres and, therefore, result in some overlapping in the activities developed.

Table 5: SV's activity aims and financing mechanisms used

Variables	Likelihood Ratio		Goodman and Kruskal λ		Cramer V		Odds ratio
	Value	Sig. (2 sided)	Value	Sig.	Value	Sig.	
To complete services supplied by the markets	1.982	0.159	0.030	0.158	0.172	0.155	2.143
To complete services supplied by the public sector	0.032	0.858	0.000	0.859	0.022	0.858	1.095
To compete with other providers	0.191	0.662	0.003	0.661	0.054	0.658	1.429
To compete with the public sector	1.774	0.183	0.017	0.293	0.129	0.289	0
To perform an activity that is not provided by the public or the private sectors	0.938	0.333	0.013	0.342	0.116	0.338	0.583

***. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha=0.01$; **. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha=0.05$; *. The result is statistically significant, for $\alpha=0.10$;

6. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The main goal of the research presented in this paper was to broaden the knowledge basis of social crowdfunding for local and regional development, addressing its potential as a new instrument of regional policy. This was empirically approached through the examination of the main characteristics of the social projects available on the Portuguese Social Stock Exchange platform. Our objective is to be able of making practical contributions for social entrepreneurs, managers of similar platforms and policy makers, and, lastly, to explore the potential contribution of crowdfunding to regional development.

The study emphasizes that social change can be accomplished by including the crowdfunding as an alternative source of financing social projects. This decision might be able to promote local economic revitalization by launching new services for disadvantaged communities. In times of crisis such as the one some countries (including Portugal) are living, resources (human, financial, physical) are critical for sustaining social organizations. The State hardly can give a major contribution to support social ventures, even if they take place in peripheral territories. In these circumstances, an innovative financial instrument like crowdfunding can play a role, both, as a way of gathering resources to social entrepreneurs, and as a net contributor to regional development.

The potential of crowdfunding is closely related with philanthropic concerns in struggling to help solve social problems and in the affective relationship kept by certain internal and external agents towards their places of origin or the one of their ancestors and relatives. Exploring this affective link is surely rewarding, as seen from time to time when people is confronted with certain natural disasters or other adverse circumstances.

The study found that more recent SV are more likely to access PSSE than those aged over 10 years, what is not surprising since social CF is a recent phenomenon and the existence of PSSE is also quite novel. The empirical data suggest that local and regional SV are much more likely to use PSSE than those ventures which act at national or international levels. Furthermore, statistical results indicate that there is no significant association between geographical location and the type of SV pursued. Also, it is worth mentioning that, in most cases, both PSSE projects and Non-Governmental Organizations complemented the services offered by the State or by the private sector. Further, about a quarter of the projects present in PSSE operated in areas that were not being addressed neither by the services offered by the State nor by the ones of the private sector.

The propensity of social entrepreneurs to use CF may have its explanation on the socio-economic characteristics of the local community they aim to reach. A possible reason for that can be related with the efficacy of appealing to philanthropic attitudes when we are dealing with "localized" social projects due to their capacity to get the affinity of people based on close relationships with territories, inside and outside the region, taken by them as their mother land or the one of their relatives. An alternative explanation may be the access that NGOs have, due to their links and scope of action, to other kind of incentive programs, which makes the search of new financing sources not so demanding.

In summary, a positive relationship does seem to verify between local and regional social initiatives and the use of CF as an instrument to promote social change in local communities.

Based on our results, it seems there is place for managers to systematically design and implement potential improvements into their social crowdfunding platforms in order to attract the crowd to invest in social projects. On the other hand, social entrepreneurs do seem to have the chance to capture a considerable amount of financial resources to develop SV by improving the awareness of the social problems and the projects that are design to improve the quality of life of the residents. Likewise, social entrepreneurs must target particular agents outside the territory in order to maintain an affective relationship with the local communities and their residents.

As underlined by the more recent theoretical frameworks on regional development, not everything is explained on the basis of resources endowment. Knowing that, the search for solutions to social and territorial problems has to rely on innovative instruments and agents of change. Entrepreneurship (social or not) is, surely, an essential key of the regional development process. In this regard, policy makers can play a strategic role in fostering social entrepreneurship by functioning as catalysts by simplifying the legislative environment and develop policy initiatives (advice, technical training, information on several issues related to the launching of social entrepreneurships, etc.) that support the accomplishment of social organizations' mission. If crowdfunding can be a valuable source of regional funding to attack a few of the problems felt by certain communities and territories, social entrepreneurs should explore its potential, and public authorities should, at least, look to donors as people deserving special recognition by its philanthropic role.

The study paper suffers from several limitations that might inhibit the generalization of the results to social entrepreneurs operating under different conditions. First, all the social entrepreneurs participating in the study are

Portuguese, operating in the same domestic environment and online platform (PSSE). Thus, findings may not be directly applicable to social entrepreneurs operating in other domestic or foreign platforms and other countries. Second, the codification scheme used to classify the variables SV's characteristics, audience target and aims was based on a dichotomous and not an interval scale which prevent us of using more advanced statistical techniques. Third, the study focused on a number of factors that need further analysis. The use of supplementary qualitative methods can uncover greater depth of insights of the social entrepreneur's regional orientation, and improve our understanding about the strategies used both by the managers of the crowdfunding platform and by crowdfunders and crowdfundees. Future research could include the study of other online platforms dedicated to finance social projects in order to validate the conclusions attained in the PSSE case. Also, the motivations of crowdfunders and crowdfundees to be engaged in the social projects listed in CF platforms could enhance our understanding of the phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- Acs, Z. J. (Ed.) (2010). *Entrepreneurship and regional development*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Alvord, S., Brown, D. & Letts, C. (2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40, 260-282.
- Azmat, F. (2013). Sustainable development in developing countries: The role of social entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36 (5), 293-304.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T. & Schwienbacher, A. (2014). Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(5), 585-609.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T. and Schwienbacher, A. (2013) Individual crowdfunding practices, *Venture Capital*, 15(4), 313-333.
- Berzin, S. C., Pitt-Catsoules, M. & Peterson, M (2014). Role of State-Level Governments in Fostering Social Innovation. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 13, 135–155.
- Borzaga, C. & Galera, G. (2012). The concept and practice of social enterprise. Lessons from the Italian Experience. *International Review of Social Research*, 2 (2), 95-112.
- Bouncken, R. B., Komorek, M. & Kraus, S (2015). Crowdfunding: the current state of research. *International Business & Economic Research Journal*, 14(3), 407-415.
- Cajaiba-Santana, G. (2010). Socially constructed opportunities in social entrepreneurship: a structuration model. In Fayolle, A. & Matlay, H. (eds.), *Handbook of research on social entrepreneurship* (88-106). Massachusetts: Edward Elgar.
- CASE (2008). Developing the field of social entrepreneurship. *Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship*. Retrieved November 15, 2014, from http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/CASE_Field-Building_Report_June08.pdf.
- Cherodian, R. & Thirlwall, A.P. (2013), *Regional disparities in per capita income in India: convergence or divergence*. School of Economics Discussion Paper, University of Kent, KPDE.
- Covin, J. & Slevin, D. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 16 (1), 7-25.
- Dallabrida, Valdir (2010). *Desenvolvimento Regional: porque algumas regiões se desenvolvem e outras não?* Ed. EDUNISC, Santa Cruz do Sul.
- De Clercq, D., Lim, D. S., & Oh, C. H. 2013. Individual-Level Resources and New Business Activity: The Contingent Role of Institutional Context. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(2): 303-330.
- European Communities (2011), *Empowering people, driving change: social innovation in the European Union*, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.
- Feld, B. (2012). *Startup Communities: building an entrepreneurial ecosystem in your city*, Hoboken: NJ, Wiley.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. (2nd edition). London: Sage Publications.
- Freitas Santos, J. & Cadima Ribeiro, J. (2005). Portuguese olive oil and the price of regional products: does designation of origin really matters? *Tékhnē - Review of Applied Management Studies*, 2(3), 61-76.
- Friedman, V. & Desivilya, H. (2010). Integrating social entrepreneurship and conflict engagement for regional development in divided societies. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, 22 (6), 495-514.
- Gajda, O & Walton, J. (2013). Review of crowdfunding for development initiatives. IMC Worldwide for Evidence on Demand. UK Department for International Development, London.
- Grecco, C. (2010). Bolsa de valores sociais. In C. Azevedo, R. Franco, & J. Meneses (Eds.), *Gestão de organizações sem fins lucrativos* (99-104), Lisboa: Vida Económica.
- Guézennec, C. & Malochet, G. (2013). *Impact investing: a way to finance the social and solidarity economy: an international comparison*, Commissariat General à la Stratégie et à la Prospective, No. 2013 – 02, Paris.
- Hill, C. W. L. & Jones, G. R. (2013). *Strategic Management: an integrated approach*, Tenth edition, Mason: South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- Hoogendoorn, B. & Hartog, C. (2011). Prevalence and determinants of social entrepreneurship at the macro-level. Scales Research Reports H201022, *EIM Business and Policy Research*. Retrieved November 29, 2014, from <http://www.entrepreneurship-sme.eu/pdf-ez/H201022.pdf>
- Karlsson, C., Johansson, B. & Stough, R. R. (2010). *Entrepreneurship and regional development*, Massachusetts: Edward Elgar.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Krugman, Paul (1998). What's new about the new economic geography? *Review of Economic Policy*, 14(2), 7-17.
- Kuznets, Simon (1973). Modern economic growth: findings and reflexions. *The American Economic Review*, 63(3), 247-258.
- Lambro, M. (2012). Enterprising differently: Markets, policy contexts and social enterprises. *International Review of Social Research*, 2 (2), 91-94.
- Lehner, O. M. & Nicholls, A. (2014). Social finance and crowdfunding for social enterprises: a public-private case study providing legitimacy and leverage, *Venture Capital: An International Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance*, 16(3), 271-286.
- Lehner, O. M. (2013). Crowdfunding social ventures: a model and research agenda, *Venture Capital: An International Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance*, 15(4), 289-311.
- Levie, J., & Autio, E. 2008. A theoretical grounding and test of the GEM model. *Small Business Economics*, 31(3), 235-263.

- Maillat, Denis (2002). Globalização, meio inovador e sistemas territoriais de produção. *Revista Internacional de Desenvolvimento*, 3 (4), 9-16.
- Mair, J. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: taking stock and looking ahead. In A. Fayolle & H. Matlay (eds.), *Handbook of research on social entrepreneurship* (15-28), Massachusetts: Edward Elgar.
- Malhotra, N. K. (1999). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- McAnany, E. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship and Communication for Development and Social Change- Rethinking Innovation. *Nordicom Review*, 33, 205-218.
- Mitra, J. (2012). *Entrepreneurship, innovation and regional development: an introduction*, New York: Routledge.
- Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: an exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 1-16.
- Moritz, A. & Block, J. (2014). Crowdfunding: a literature review and research directions, Retrieved November 20, 2014, from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2554444> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2554444>.
- Naghiu, A., Vázquez, J. L. & Geogiev, I. (2005). Rural development strategies through rural tourism activities in Romania: chance for an internal demand? *International Review on Public and Non Profit Marketing*, 2(1), 85-95.
- Nega, B. & Schneider, G. (2014). NGOs, the State, and Development in Africa. *Review of Social Economy*, 72 (4), 485–503.
- Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done?. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33 (3), 301-314.
- OECD (2014). The changing role of NGOs and civil society in financing sustainable development, in *Development Co-operation Report 2014: Mobilising Resources for Sustainable Development* (109-119), OECD Publishing.
- Oomen, J, Gligorov, R. & Hildebrand, M. (2014). Waisda?: making videos findable through crowdsourced annotations. In Ridge, M. (Ed.). *Crowdsourcing our cultural heritage*, Ashgate, Surrey. 161-184.
- Parente, C., Barbosa, A. & Vilhena, F. (2012) Applying the concept of social entrepreneurship to the brazilian experience with technology incubators of popular cooperatives. In *10th International Conference Democratization, Marketization, and the Third Sector. International Society of Third Sector*, Siena. Retrieved October 11, 2014, from <http://web3.letras.up.pt/empsoc/index.php/produtos/category/11-artigos>.
- Polèse, M. (1998). *Economia urbana e regional: lógica espacial das transformações económicas*. Ed. APDR, Coimbra.
- Quintão, C. (2004). Empresas de inserção e renovação do terceiro sector - notas em torno das problemáticas e desafios no contexto da União Europeia, *Atas do VIII Congresso Luso-Afro-Brasileiro das ciências sociais*. Retrieved November 16, 2014, from <http://www.letras.up.pt/isociologia/uploads/files/Working6.pdf>
- Ridge, M. (2014). Crowdsourcing our cultural heritage: introduction. In Ridge, M. (Ed.). *Crowdsourcing our cultural heritage*, Ashgate, Surrey. 1-13.
- Rocha-Trindade, M.B. (1996). Migrações, Regionalização, Regionalismo. In J. P. Neto et al. (Coord.) *Regionalização e Desenvolvimento: fórum 2000* (269-281). Lisbon : I.S.C.S.P.
- Romer, Paul (1986). Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(5), 1002-1037.
- Schwiebacher, A. & Larralde, B. (2012). Crowdfunding of small entrepreneurial ventures. In Cumming, D. *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurial Finance* (369-392). Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Shockley, G. & Frank, P. (2011). The functions of government in social entrepreneurship: Theory and preliminary evidence. *Regional Science Policy and Practice*, 3 (3), 181-198.
- Silva, J.F. & Cadima Ribeiro, J. (2014). As Assimetrias Regionais em Portugal: análise da convergência versus divergência ao nível dos municípios. *DRd – Desenvolvimento Regional em Debate*, 4(1), 84-109.
- Souziázis, E. & Antunes, M. (2006). Two speed regional convergence in Portugal and the importance of structural funds growth. *Economia*, 9(2), 222-241.
- Tomczak, A. & Brem, A (2013) A conceptualized investment model of crowdfunding, *Venture Capital: An International Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance*, 15(4), 335-359.
- Urbano, D. & Ferri, E. (2011). Environmental factors and social entrepreneurship. *Working Paper of Department of Business Economics, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*.
- Vazquez Barquero, A. (2006). Surgimiento y transformación de clusters y milieux en los procesos de desarrollo. *Revista Eure*, 32 (95), 75-92.
- Weerawardena, J. & Mort, G. (2006). Investigating social entrepreneurship: A multidimensional model. *Journal of World Business*, 41 (1), 21-35.
- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship - Conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35 (1), 165-184.
- Whitley, R. 1999. *Divergent capitalisms: The social structuring and change of business systems*: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (2013). Crowdfunding's Potential for the Developing World. infoDev, Finance and Private Sector Development Department. Washington, DC.
- Yiu, D. W.; Wan, W. P.; Ng, F. W.; Chen, X.; & Su, J. (2014). Sentimental Drivers of Social Entrepreneurship: A Study of China's Guangcai (Glorious) Program. *Management and Organization Review*, 10 (1), 55–80.
- Ziegler, R. (2009). *An introduction to social entrepreneurship: Voices, preconditions, contexts*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.