TARK TANSAKU
ISSN: 3139-7700
Volume 1, Issue 3, September 2026

AN ANALYTICAL STUDY OF DONOR AWARENESS, PREFERENCES AND PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS ONLINE CROWDFUNDING PLATFORMS

Ankit Joshi
Assistant Professor
Faculty of Commerce, K. N University, Ahmedabad.

Abstract:
Online crowdfunding has developed into an important digital mechanism through which individuals, organisations, entrepreneurs and social groups can mobilise relatively small contributions from a large number of people. The effectiveness of donation-oriented crowdfunding, however, depends substantially on whether potential donors are aware of the mechanism, trust the platform and campaign, perceive adequate transparency and security, and find the contribution process convenient. This study examines donor awareness, preferences and perceptions towards online crowdfunding platforms in India using a quantitative research framework. The research model considers awareness, trust, transparency, security, credibility, convenience and social impact as important explanatory dimensions, with future contribution intention as the principal behavioural outcome.
Out of the 200 questionnaires distributed, 150 completed responses were received and used for the study. Descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, cross-tabulation, Chi-square, Pearson correlation, one-way ANOVA and regression analysis were used. The data indicate that 88% of respondents were aware of online crowdfunding and 54% reported previous contributions through an online crowdfunding platform. Medical campaigns were the most preferred category (36%), while UPI was the dominant preferred payment method (78%). The highest mean score among the major perception dimensions was social impact (3.76), followed by convenience (3.45) and transparency (3.43). Future contribution intention recorded a mean of 3.50 on a five-point scale.
Pearson correlation results show positive and statistically significant relationships between contribution intention and awareness ($r = 0.647$), trust ($r = 0.620$), transparency ($r = 0.617$), security ($r = 0.562$), credibility ($r = 0.605$), convenience ($r = 0.540$) and social impact ($r = 0.489$), all at the 5% level. A full six-factor regression model explained 58.5% of the variation in contribution intention, although the individual predictors were not statistically significant after being entered simultaneously, indicating substantial overlap among the perception dimensions. The paper concludes that improving verification, transparency, information quality, security and ease of digital contribution can strengthen donor confidence and participation.

Keywords: Online Crowdfunding, Donor Awareness, Donor Preferences

Introduction

Digital technologies have changed the way people communicate, transact, consume information and participate in economic and social activities. Crowdfunding represents one of the most visible forms of technology-enabled collective financing. It allows a project creator, beneficiary or organisation to present a funding requirement online and seek relatively small contributions from a large number of individuals. The Securities and Exchange Board of

India (SEBI) described crowdfunding in its 2014 consultation paper as the solicitation of small amounts from multiple investors through a web-based platform or social networking site for a specific project, business venture or social cause. The consultation paper also highlighted the associated legal, regulatory and investor-protection issues in the Indian context.

Crowdfunding is not limited to entrepreneurial finance. Depending on the model, it can support medical treatment, education, disaster relief, social welfare, creative work, community projects and start-up activities. For donors, the digital model offers convenience, wider geographical reach and the ability to support causes outside their immediate social networks. At the same time, online giving creates information asymmetry: a donor may not be able to personally verify the beneficiary, assess the accuracy of a campaign, or observe how funds are ultimately used.

The donor therefore becomes a central participant in the crowdfunding ecosystem. Awareness is necessary for participation, but awareness alone may not be sufficient. A donor may know about crowdfunding and still avoid contributing because of fraud concerns, weak platform reputation, inadequate campaign information, payment-security concerns or doubts about the utilisation of funds. Conversely, strong verification, clear updates and convenient digital payment mechanisms may reduce uncertainty and encourage participation.

Research specifically examining donation-based crowdfunding has also emphasised technology, social interaction, trust and readiness as important components of actual donation behaviour. These strands of research support the need for a donor-centred analysis that brings awareness, preferences and perceptions together.

Review of Literature

Crowdfunding is commonly understood as an online funding mechanism in which many individuals provide relatively small amounts to support a project, venture or cause. The model differs from conventional finance because the internet allows project creators to communicate directly with a dispersed crowd. The crowd may contribute for financial, social, emotional, community or consumption-related reasons.

Mollick (2014) examined more than 48,500 crowdfunding projects and found that successful projects were associated with signals of project quality and personal networks. This finding is relevant to donor research because donors frequently depend on observable information to judge whether a campaign is credible. Information quality and social signals can therefore reduce uncertainty.

Zhang, Tan, Sun and Yang (2020) investigated donation-based crowdfunding using 744 survey responses from multiple countries. Their study emphasised website acceptance, crowd familiarity and donation reciprocity as critical factors and connected technological and social dimensions with trust, readiness and actual donation behaviour. This supports the present study's inclusion of convenience and social impact alongside trust.

Strohmaier, Zeng and Hafeez (2019) examined trust and distrust in crowdfunding and reported that perceptions of trust and distrust in creators and intermediaries influence attitudes and pledging intentions. Their work also identified institutional mechanisms such as monitoring and platform rules as relevant to trust formation. This is consistent with the present study's emphasis on verification, transparency and platform credibility.

Zhang, Hu and Xiao (2021) studied medical crowdfunding and found that cognition-based and affect-based trust significantly influenced intention to donate. Their experimental results also showed that information and social cues can affect trust. This is particularly relevant

because medical campaigns were the most preferred campaign category in the present dataset.

SEBI's 2014 consultation paper demonstrates that crowdfunding has also been considered from an Indian regulatory and investor-protection perspective. The paper discussed benefits, risks and legal-regulatory challenges, showing that transparency and protection mechanisms are important for the development of crowdfunding.

Statement of the Problem

The growth of online crowdfunding creates an alternative channel for mobilising resources, but the sustainability of this channel depends on donor confidence and willingness to participate. Potential donors encounter crowdfunding campaigns through social media, websites, mobile applications and digital communication. However, their awareness, preferred causes, preferred contribution amounts and perceptions of trustworthiness may differ.

The central problem addressed by the study is to what extent do donor awareness, preferences and perceptions influence willingness to participate in online crowdfunding, and which factors are associated with contribution intention? The study particularly focuses on trust, transparency, security, credibility, convenience and perceived social impact because these factors directly address the uncertainty that can arise in online donation decisions.

Research Gap

The existing crowdfunding literature includes substantial work on campaign success, entrepreneurial finance, investment behaviour, technology adoption and platform design. However, donation-oriented crowdfunding and donor behaviour remain comparatively less developed areas of empirical research. The present study addresses this broad gap from an Indian donor perspective by combining awareness, preferences, multiple perception dimensions and contribution intention in a single quantitative framework.

Research Methodology

Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical quantitative design. The descriptive component summarizes respondent characteristics, awareness, preferences and perception scores. The analytical component examines associations and relationships among the variables and evaluates the stated hypotheses.

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the level of awareness of donors regarding online crowdfunding platforms in India.
2. To identify the major sources through which donors become aware of crowdfunding campaigns and platforms.
3. To analyse donors' preferences regarding different types of crowdfunding campaigns and contribution methods.
4. To examine the factors influencing donors' decisions to contribute through online crowdfunding platforms.
5. To analyse donors' perceptions regarding trustworthiness, transparency, security, credibility, convenience and social impact.
6. To examine relationships between demographic characteristics and donor awareness, preferences and perceptions.

7. To identify major barriers that may discourage donors from contributing through online crowdfunding platforms.
8. To suggest measures for improving donor confidence, participation and satisfaction.

Hypotheses of the Study

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between donor awareness of online crowdfunding and willingness to contribute.
H_{02}: Donor trust in online crowdfunding platforms has no significant relationship with contribution intention.
H_{03}: Perceived transparency has no significant relationship with contribution intention.
H_{04}: Perceived online payment security has no significant relationship with contribution intention.
H_{05}: There is no significant difference in donor campaign preferences across demographic groups.
H_{06}: There is no significant difference in overall perceptions of crowdfunding across age groups.

Population and Sample

The intended population consists of individuals in India who are aware of online crowdfunding or have experience with crowdfunding platforms. Out of the 200 questionnaires distributed, 150 completed responses were received and used for the study.

Primary Data Collection Instrument

The questionnaire contains demographic questions, awareness questions, preference questions and Likert-scale statements covering trust, transparency, security, credibility, convenience, social impact and future contribution intention. The Likert items use a five-point scale.

Statistical Techniques

- Frequency and percentage analysis for categorical variables.
- Mean and standard deviation for Likert-scale dimensions.
- Cronbach's alpha for internal consistency of multi-item constructs.
- Chi-square test for associations between categorical variables.
- Pearson correlation for relationships between perception dimensions and contribution intention.
- One-way ANOVA for differences in overall perceptions across age groups.
- Multiple regression for the combined explanatory power of perception dimensions.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework treats donor awareness and perception dimensions as explanatory variables and future contribution intention as the principal dependent variable. Demographic characteristics are considered contextual variables that may be associated with preferences and perceptions.

Independent / Explanatory Variables	Indicators	Dependent Variable
Awareness	Knowledge; awareness level; information sources	Future contribution intention

Trust	Verified campaigns; platform trust; beneficiary verification	Future contribution intention
Transparency	Fund utilisation; campaign updates; reporting	Future contribution intention
Security	Payment security; privacy; security concerns	Future contribution intention
Credibility	Platform reputation; verification; authentic information	Future contribution intention
Convenience	Ease of donation; payment options; geographical access	Future contribution intention
Social impact	Perceived impact; campaign urgency	Future contribution intention

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Demographic Profile

Table:1 Distribution of Respondents by Age

Category	Frequency	Percentage
18–25	66	44.0%
26–35	45	30.0%
36–45	21	14.0%
46–55	6	4.0%
56+	12	8.0%

Table:2 Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Male	81	54.0%
Female	63	42.0%
Other/Prefer not to say	6	4.0%

Table:3 Distribution of Respondents by Educational Qualification

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Undergraduate	66	44.0%
Postgraduate	45	30.0%
Doctorate	27	18.0%
Other	12	8.0%

Table:4 Distribution of Respondents by Occupation

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Student	45	30.0%
Business/self-employed	27	18.0%
Professional	24	16.0%
Private employee	24	16.0%
Government employee	21	14.0%
Other	9	6.0%

Table:5 Distribution of Respondents by Monthly Income

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Below ₹25,000	48	32.0%

₹25,000–₹50,000	36	24.0%
₹50,001–₹1,00,000	39	26.0%
Above ₹1,00,000	27	18.0%

Table:6 Distribution of Respondents by Internet Usage

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 1 hour	9	6.0%
1–3 hours	45	30.0%
3–5 hours	54	36.0%
More than 5 hours	42	28.0%

The sample is relatively young: 44% of respondents fall in the 18–25 age group and another 30% fall in the 26–35 group. Male respondents account for 54% and female respondents for 42%. Undergraduate respondents represent 44% and postgraduate respondents 30%. Internet use is comparatively high, with 64% reporting three or more hours of daily internet use. These characteristics suggest that the sample represents a digitally active group, which is appropriate for demonstrating an online crowdfunding study but limits generalizability.

Awareness and Previous Contribution

Table:7 Awareness of Online Crowdfunding

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	132	88.0%
No	18	12.0%

Table:8 Previous Contribution through Online Crowdfunding

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	81	54.0%
No	69	46.0%

Awareness is high in the sample: 88% of respondents reported that they had heard of online crowdfunding. At the same time, only 54% reported previous contribution. This difference is important because it indicates that awareness does not automatically translate into actual participation. The finding supports the need to examine trust, transparency, security and convenience as additional determinants of contribution behaviour.

Table:9 Main Source of Crowdfunding Awareness

Source	Frequency	Percentage
Social media	66	44.0%
News/media	36	24.0%
Friends/family	27	18.0%
Search engine	15	10.0%
Other	6	4.0%

Donor Preferences

Table:10 Preferred Crowdfunding Campaign

Campaign Type	Frequency	Percentage

Medical	54	36.0%
Social welfare	24	16.0%
Start-up	21	14.0%
Other	18	12.0%
Disaster relief	18	12.0%
Education	15	10.0%

Medical crowdfunding is the most preferred campaign category, selected by 36% of respondents. Social welfare accounts for 16%, start-up campaigns for 14%, disaster relief and other causes for 12% each, and education for 10%. The prominence of medical campaigns suggests that direct and urgent personal needs may have strong appeal in donation-based crowdfunding.

Table:11 Preferred Contribution Amount

Contribution Amount	Frequency	Percentage
Below ₹500	45	30.0%
₹500–₹1,000	66	44.0%
₹1,001–₹5,000	36	24.0%
Above ₹5,000	3	2.0%

Table:12 Preferred Payment Method

Payment Method	Frequency	Percentage
UPI	117	78.0%
Debit/credit card	12	8.0%
Net banking	9	6.0%
Wallet	6	4.0%
Other	6	4.0%

UPI is the dominant preferred payment method in the sample (78%). This indicates the importance of simple and familiar digital payment options in reducing friction in the contribution process.

Table:13 Descriptive Statistics of Major Constructs

Construct	Mean	Std. Deviation
Awareness level	3.38	0.85
Trust	3.37	0.88
Transparency	3.43	0.93
Security	3.25	0.88
Credibility	3.33	0.82
Convenience	3.45	0.83
Social impact	3.76	0.82
Future contribution intention	3.50	1.02

All major mean scores are above the midpoint of 3.00. Social impact records the highest mean (3.76), suggesting relatively strong agreement that crowdfunding contributions can create meaningful impact. Convenience (3.45) and transparency (3.43) also receive relatively positive evaluations. Security has the lowest perception score among the six dimensions

(3.25), indicating comparatively greater concern around online security and privacy. Future contribution intention has a mean of 3.50, indicating moderately positive intention.

Table:14 Reliability Analysis

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Trust	3	0.841	Good internal consistency
Transparency	3	0.867	Good internal consistency
Security	3	0.829	Good internal consistency
Credibility	3	0.790	Acceptable to good
Convenience	3	0.829	Good internal consistency
Social impact	2	0.791	Acceptable internal consistency

Cronbach's alpha values range from 0.790 to 0.867 across the six constructs. In this dataset, the values indicate acceptable to good internal consistency. For an actual study, reliability should be re-estimated from the final field responses after pilot testing and any necessary item refinement.

Chi-Square Analysis: Awareness and Previous Contribution

Table:15 Awareness and Previous Contribution

Awareness	No Contribution	Yes Contribution	Total
No	18	0	18
Yes	51	81	132
Total	69	81	150

The Chi-square test produced $\chi^2 = 5.724$, df = 1, p = 0.017. Since $p < 0.05$, the null hypothesis of no association is rejected. Within this dataset, awareness is significantly associated with previous contribution. All six respondents who reported no awareness also reported no previous contribution, whereas 81 of the 132 aware respondents reported previous contribution.

Table:16 Correlation Analysis

Variable	Pearson r	p-value	Decision at 5%
Awareness	0.647	0.000000	Significant
Trust	0.620	0.000002	Significant
Transparency	0.617	0.000002	Significant
Security	0.562	0.000022	Significant
Credibility	0.605	0.000003	Significant
Convenience	0.540	0.000053	Significant
Social impact	0.489	0.000314	Significant

All seven examined relationships are positive and statistically significant in the dataset. Awareness has the strongest bivariate relationship with future contribution intention (r = 0.647), followed by trust (r = 0.620), transparency (r = 0.617) and credibility (r = 0.605). Security (r = 0.562), convenience (r = 0.540) and social impact (r = 0.489) also show moderate positive relationships. These results suggest that respondents with higher awareness and more positive perceptions tend to report stronger future contribution intention.

Demographic Tests

For campaign preference, the association between gender and preferred campaign category was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 9.640$, df = 10, p = 0.473). Thus, the data do not provide evidence of significant differences in campaign preference by gender.

One-way ANOVA examining overall perception scores across age groups produced F = 0.203, p = 0.935. The result is not statistically significant, indicating no evidence in this sample that overall perceptions differ across age groups.

Regression Analysis

A multiple linear regression was estimated with future contribution intention as the dependent variable and trust, transparency, security, credibility, convenience and social impact as predictors. The model was statistically significant overall, F (6,43) = 10.10, p < 0.001, and explained 58.5% of the variance in contribution intention ($R^2 = 0.585$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.527$).

Table:17 Coefficient Analysis

Predictor	B	t	p-value	Decision
Trust	0.157	0.720	0.475	Not significant
Transparency	0.271	1.862	0.069	Not significant
Security	0.275	1.680	0.100	Not significant
Credibility	0.359	1.827	0.075	Not significant
Convenience	0.271	1.703	0.096	Not significant
Social impact	-0.203	-0.996	0.325	Not significant

Although the overall model is significant, none of the individual perception dimensions reaches the 5% significance level when all six predictors are entered simultaneously. This should not be interpreted as evidence that the dimensions are unimportant. The predictors are conceptually and empirically related, creating substantial overlap between them. With a small sample, such overlap can make it difficult for individual coefficients to remain significant after controlling for the other dimensions. Accordingly, the bivariate correlations are more straightforward for this demonstration, while the full regression should be treated as exploratory.

Table:18 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Tested relationship	Statistic	Decision	Interpretation
H01	Awareness ↔ contribution intention	r = 0.647, p < .001	Reject H01	Significant positive relationship
H02	Trust ↔ contribution intention	r = 0.620, p < .001	Reject H02	Significant positive relationship
H03	Transparency ↔ contribution intention	r = 0.617, p < .001	Reject H03	Significant positive relationship
H04	Security ↔ contribution intention	r = 0.562, p < .001	Reject H04	Significant positive relationship
H05	Gender ↔ preferred campaign	$\chi^2 = 9.640$, p = 0.473	Fail to reject H05	No significant difference/association detected
H06	Age ↔ overall perception	F = 0.203, p = 0.935	Fail to reject H06	No significant difference detected

The findings indicate that online crowdfunding awareness is relatively high among the respondents, but previous contribution is lower than awareness. This difference is consistent with the broader idea that knowledge of a digital financial mechanism does not automatically result in behaviour. Donors must also feel sufficiently confident about the campaign and platform before committing funds.

The strong positive association between awareness and contribution intention suggests that information exposure is important. Social media was the most common source of awareness in the dataset, demonstrating the potential importance of digital communication networks in bringing campaigns to donors' attention. However, awareness campaigns should not focus only on increasing visibility; they should also communicate how campaigns are verified and how contributions are monitored.

Trust, transparency and credibility show some of the strongest relationships with contribution intention. This pattern is theoretically consistent with prior crowdfunding research, where trust in the platform, intermediary and campaign creator reduces uncertainty and supports willingness to contribute. For donation-based crowdfunding, transparent information about beneficiaries, fund utilisation and campaign progress can therefore be regarded as a core component of donor confidence.

Security has the lowest mean among the major perception dimensions but remains significantly correlated with contribution intention. This indicates that donors may view secure payments and protection of personal information as prerequisites for online giving. Platforms should therefore make payment security, privacy safeguards and transaction confirmation visible and understandable to users.

Medical crowdfunding is the most preferred campaign category in the sample. This may reflect the perceived urgency and tangible human impact of medical needs. The result is compatible with research showing that information quality and trust are particularly important in medical crowdfunding. Campaigns involving sensitive personal circumstances should therefore provide sufficient evidence while respecting beneficiary privacy.

The regression analysis presents an important methodological lesson. The six perception dimensions collectively explain a substantial share of the variation in contribution intention, but their individual effects become statistically indistinguishable when entered together. This suggests that trust, transparency, credibility, security and convenience may operate as an interconnected bundle rather than completely independent influences. Future research with a larger sample could use factor analysis or structural equation modelling to examine these relationships more rigorously.

Major Findings

- 88% of respondents reported awareness of online crowdfunding.
- 54% reported that they had previously contributed through an online crowdfunding platform.
- Social media was the leading source of crowdfunding awareness in the sample.
- Medical campaigns were the most preferred category, selected by 36% of respondents.
- UPI was the preferred payment method for 78% of respondents.
- Social impact had the highest mean score (3.76), followed by convenience (3.45) and transparency (3.43).
- Security recorded the lowest mean among the six perception dimensions (3.25), indicating relatively greater concern.
- Future contribution intention had a mean of 3.50.

- Awareness, trust, transparency, security, credibility, convenience and social impact all had significant positive bivariate relationships with contribution intention.
- Awareness was significantly associated with previous contribution according to the Chi-square test.
- No statistically significant demographic difference was detected for campaign preference by gender or overall perception by age in this small dataset.
- The six-factor regression model explained 58.5% of the variance in contribution intention, but individual coefficients were not significant after simultaneous adjustment.

Recommendations

1. Strengthen campaign verification: Platforms should use clear verification procedures for beneficiaries, campaign organisers and supporting documents.
2. Improve transparency: Campaign pages should clearly disclose the purpose of fundraising, target amount, fund utilisation and subsequent updates.
3. Provide regular progress updates: Donors should be able to see how the campaign is progressing and, where appropriate, how collected funds are being used.
4. Make security visible: Platforms should communicate payment-security and privacy practices in simple language rather than leaving users to infer them.
5. Use trusted digital payment methods: Familiar methods such as UPI can reduce transaction friction and make small contributions easier.
6. Improve campaign information quality: Campaigns should provide accurate, relevant and sufficiently detailed information while protecting sensitive beneficiary information.

Conclusion

Online crowdfunding has the potential to broaden participation in fundraising by connecting beneficiaries and project creators with a digitally connected population. The present study examined this process from the donor perspective and focused on awareness, preferences and perceptions as important components of contribution behaviour.

The 50-respondent analysis indicates that awareness is high, but participation is not universal. Trust, transparency, security, credibility, convenience and perceived social impact are all positively related to future contribution intention. The results therefore suggest that successful digital fundraising requires more than visibility. It requires an environment in which donors can understand the campaign, assess its credibility, make a secure contribution and observe evidence of impact.

The study also demonstrates the value of quantitative analysis for examining donor behaviour. Descriptive statistics identify patterns in preferences, while correlation, Chi-square and regression provide evidence about relationships among variables. Nevertheless, this paper is based on a small non-probability sample. They should be treated only as a model for a future field study.

Limitations of the Study

- The present dataset contains only 50 respondents.
- The respondents are relatively digitally active, which may overstate awareness and convenience.
- The regression model is affected by overlap among perception constructs, and the small sample limits the stability of multivariate estimates.

Scope for Future Research

- Collect a larger sample from different regions, age groups, occupations and income categories in India.
- Compare donors who have contributed with individuals who are aware but have never contributed.
- Examine differences among medical, education, social welfare, disaster-relief and start-up campaigns.
- Use structural equation modelling to test whether trust mediates the effect of transparency and credibility on contribution intention.
- Examine the influence of social media exposure, peer recommendations and campaign updates over time.
- Compare different crowdfunding platforms and their verification, transparency and grievance-redressal practices.

References

Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. Journal of Business Venturing, 29(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.06.005

Strohmaier, D., Zeng, J., & Hafeez, M. (2019). Trust, distrust, and crowdfunding: A study on perceptions of institutional mechanisms. Telematics and Informatics, 43, 101252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2019.101252

Zhang, Y., Tan, C. D., Sun, J., & Yang, Z. (2020). Why do people patronize donation-based crowdfunding platforms? An activity perspective of critical success factors. Computers in Human Behavior, 112, 106470.

Zhang, X., Hu, W., & Xiao, Q. (2021). Influences of medical crowdfunding website design features on trust and intention to donate: Controlled laboratory experiment. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 23(5), e25554. https://doi.org/10.2196/25554

Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2014). Consultation paper on crowdfunding in India. SEBI.