

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323919336>

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding

Article in *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* · March 2018

DOI: 10.1007/s10606-018-9307-3

CITATIONS

0

READS

56

1 author:



Martin Mayer

Old Dominion University

9 PUBLICATIONS 9 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Chapter [View project](#)



Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

Martin Mayer 

School of Public Service, Old Dominion University, 2084 Constant Hall, Norfolk, VA, 23529, USA ()

Abstract. Over the past decade, crowdfunding has emerged as a legitimate, albeit niche, resource for public service delivery. Predicated on utilizing the resources of the crowd to address public issues, civic crowdfunding has the potential to offer citizens a greater role in service delivery and community development. This study investigates community dynamics and their potential impact on project success in jurisdictions proposing civic crowdfunding proposals. The results highlight the dynamics and characteristics of communities where project proposals are likely to find funding success. The results further highlight several potential opportunities for future research to better understand how and why these projects truly work.

Keywords: Crowdfunding, Community, Demographics, Participation, Inclusion, Crowdsourcing, Community investment, collaboration, Local government, Non-traditional service delivery mechanisms

1. Introduction

Local governments today face many challenges regarding public finance, service delivery, and citizen engagement that are both new and unique. Furthermore, technological innovations such as Facebook, Twitter, and a series of mobile applications are connecting citizens to their public servants in new and exciting ways (Bryson et al. 2014), raising the question of how the public sector can best integrate, crowdsource, and take advantage of these new methods of engagement. At the same time there has been a growing movement within the country aimed at greater representation and inclusiveness for citizens in government.

Civic crowdfunding can be conceptualized as the crowdsourcing of fiscal resources to address a particular community need. “Crowdfunding allows founders...to fund their efforts by drawing on relatively small contributions from a relatively large number of individuals using the internet, without standard financial intermediaries” (Mollick 2014, p. 2). Ultimately the success of the project is determined by the public’s willingness to invest in it.

The primary impact of crowdfunding is the amount of resources that it can bring into an area of need (Davies 2014). Civic crowdfunding further has the potential to increase representation, promote greater transparency, and decrease chances for fraud or other illicit activities (Miglietta et al. 2014). While project success may be impacted by the general wealth of the funding community, this is not always the

case, as awareness plays a major role in moving the campaign beyond geographic boundaries (Davies 2014).

The purpose of this work is to examine the community dynamics and demographics of civic crowdfunding participation and project success. This work provides valuable insight in a vastly expanding field about the impact of regional and societal differences and how community dynamics impact civic crowdfunding participation. This work draws primarily from the developing literature on crowdsourcing and crowdfunding, as well as research on civic engagement to provide insight and explanation into civic crowdfunding as a new model of engagement and resource development.

This research contributes to a small but growing body of literature. This study compliments and contributes to the field by building off of the civic crowdfunding literature and also incorporating research on engagement, collaboration, and the coproduction of goods and services. This work further provides a summary account of the existing literature in the field and attempts to fill a scholarship gap by examining community dynamics of civic crowdfunding participation.

2. Literature

2.1. Crowdsourcing

Conceptually crowdsourcing is a broad term; it implies the leveraging of the tools, talents, and resources of the crowd to solve any number of problems. Crowdfunding, on the other hand, depends less on the knowledge of the people and more specifically on the size of their pocketbook (Howe 2008). Crowdsourcing applies in many arenas and can take many different forms but ultimately it describes a form of resource allocation. Crowdfunding on the other hand shares one major similarity in that it too is a way in which to aggregate and distribute resources, albeit solely financial ones. In addition, both areas leverage new forms of technology and networks that have grown significantly in size over the past decade, yet neither are exclusively bound by technological advance.

Crowdsourcing describes open source, collaborative, technology-driven networks (Howe 2006). These emerging online platforms offer a way to connect entrepreneurs with a talented and often cheap labor force (Howe 2006). Crowdsourcing is built around leveraging the resources of the crowd to meet a certain and specific need or demand whether it be public or private. Although the concept is generally agreed upon, the literature diverges in several directions when attempting to describe and explain specifically what crowdsourcing is. In one of the more detailed explanations, Estellés-Arolas and González-Ladrón-de-Guevara (2012) describe crowdsourcing as “a type of participative online activity in which an individual...proposes to a group of individuals...the voluntary undertaking of a task” (p. 197). The task involves a transactional exchange between the individual proposing it, and those supporting it; often including the exchange of “work, money, knowledge, and/or experience, and

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

always entailing mutual benefit” (p. 197). In this scenario, the proposing individual receives economic, intellectual, social, or other forms of recognition or assistance, while the crowdsourcer through task fulfillment.

The process described above is a mixture of top-down and bottom-up collaboration in which both the organization and the crowd can have a direct impact on process and outcomes (Brabham 2013). The process is spurred by online technological innovations and individual participation; without participation crowdsourcing fails to exist. An effective marketing strategy and properly appealing to a societal need can play an important role in the ultimate success of the crowdsourcing process. There must be enough incentive to make individual participation worthwhile for the process to work (Seltzer and Mahmoudi 2012).

Crowdsourcing holds many possibilities for innovative product development; however, Seltzer and Mahmoudi (2012) caution that in order to be successful, significant resources need to be dedicated throughout the process by the sponsoring organization; they go on to warn that crowdsourcing “is not a substitute for other, more formal channels” of funding and service delivery (p. 9). In order to best utilize the benefits of crowdsourcing data and information, roles, boundaries, and limitations must be acknowledged and understood by those collecting the data (Clark et al. 2016).

2.2. Crowdfunding

As an emerging field, crowdfunding has often been used synonymously with crowdsourcing, and there have been a number of conflicting attempts to define it (Mollick 2014). Crowdsourcing is the more broad term that applies when utilizing the resources of the crowd to address an issue. Crowdfunding on the other hand is concerned solely with raising capital.

Griffin (2012) defines crowdfunding as “a means of capital formation that connects entrepreneurs with investors over the internet” (p. 1). In this scenario crowdfunding projects are the property of those creating the proposals and offering the service; in civic crowdfunding joint ownership is more common where those proposing the projects often work closely with funders on final project details and delivery. Belleflamme et al. (2013) define crowdfunding as “an open call, essentially through the Internet, for the provision of financial resources either in form of donation or in exchange for some form of reward and/or voting rights in order to support initiatives for specific purposes” (p. 8).

Crowdfunding is about results, an initiative has to sell itself to the funding public; each donation decision regarding a proposal serves as a barometer of public opinion and an indicator of preference revelation (Mayer 2016). In crowdfunding the primary focus is on raising capital to address a target issue; whereas crowdsourcing focuses on the aggregation of resources that take many different shapes and forms. Crowdfunding also has a greater barrier to entry than crowdsourcing, as capital is

the chief requirement to participate. Even then, wealth does not ensure participation, a number of other factors contribute.

Concerns of public value failure are legitimate in civic crowdfunding proposals, and careful consideration must be taken to mitigate against manipulation and fraud. Despite these concerns, crowdfunding has several potential benefits. By gauging citizens' willingness to pay for particular goods and services through online platforms, crowdfunding may offer unique insight beyond the more common measures of voting behavior and citizen surveys in explaining citizen participation and preference and the role that technology is increasingly playing upon them (Robbins and Simonsen 2002).

Effective public participation hinges on having an informed citizenry (Jordan et al. 2016). Increasingly, the use of technology and digital media sources have become a primary source of information exchange between administrators and citizens; the use and embrace of this media has ushered in a new form of "participatory civics" (Zuckerman 2014). "One of the characteristics of this version of civics is an interest—perhaps a need—for participants to see their impact on the issues they're trying to influence" (Zuckerman 2014, p. 156). Both crowdsourcing and crowdfunding qualify as new modes of participation that are significantly reliant on technology and digital media. Each, crowdsourcing and crowdfunding, has the potential to promote democratic processes by bringing in substantial numbers of the citizenry who may be otherwise disengaged from the traditional political process (Zuckerman 2014).

In order to properly engage and take advantage of the benefits and resources of the crowd, it ultimately becomes a matter of organizational design (Noveck 2009). Critics argue "that opening up channels of participation would create a whole new class of online lobbyists and campaigns that participate to serve their own financial interests," ultimately increasing corruption and further alienating an already weary citizenry (p. 41). Great care must be taken to safeguard against such concerns by implementing measures that serve and empower citizens through a combination of design, technology, and delegation (Noveck 2009). This can include the incorporation of feedback loops, design sessions, digital and face to face interaction and other methods aimed at increasing transparency and involvement.

2.3. Civic crowdfunding and local government

Civic crowdfunding projects offer a way to connect citizens to government through project articulation and development, particularly by highlighting project need and including citizens in the planning process prior to the funding period (Lindsay 2015; Seltzer and Mahmoudi 2012). The collective coproduction of services emphasizes the importance of direct citizen involvement in the production of community goods through alternative service delivery mechanisms (Brudney and England 1983). The coproduction of services is a dynamic process in which citizens transform the service, and in turn, "they are themselves transformed by the service" (Brandsen

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

and Pestoff 2006, p. 496). Further, the coproduced services can result in higher quality and lower cost services throughout the community (Bovaird 2007).

By incentivizing participation, public awareness can be increased in a manner that promotes transparency, collaboration, and citizen engagement (Mergel 2015b). Civic crowdfunding can be utilized as a problem-solving mechanism with the ability to supplement the budget while increasing citizen engagement by collectively identifying problems and developing solutions within the community, (Seltzer and Mahmoudi 2012). By encouraging open innovation outside of traditional organizational boundaries, government may be able to leverage the collective intelligence of the crowd to increase capacity in ways otherwise not possible (Mergel and Desouza 2013).

The recent growth of civic crowdfunding can be attributed primarily to a few factors; first, the increasing prevalence of local government not being able to provide the services that citizens have grown accustomed to in their communities. Dixon and Dogan (2002) call it governance failure when due to a lack of administrative capacity, institutional knowledge or other breakdown, government fails to provide the services citizens come to expect. This has in turn led to a hollowing of the state where the traditional roles and duties of government are increasingly filled by third party actors (Milward and Provan 2000). The resulting transformation of governance has led to a greater emphasis and need for collaborative networks but has also created a number of boundary issues between actors (Kettl 2002).

2.4. Citizen engagement

Public administrators should strive for greater civic engagement through the use of tools, practice, and process (Bingham et al. 2005). The design and incorporation of strategies to solicit citizen input is imperative. An active engaged citizenry is viewed as more than a byproduct of engagement strategies, but also as a necessary and welcomed input into administrative processes (Stoker 2006).

Civic crowdfunding broadly reorients engagement into a number of potential “new” avenues that give citizens greater voice in government (Zuckerman 2014). Zuckerman (2014) argues that the shift to broad, digital forms of engagement is a response to a feeling of helplessness and dissatisfaction with partisan politics. These levels of engagement are more prevalent and can have greater impact at the local level than in state or federal politics. One of the primary ways in which to engage citizens is through the building of multifaceted coalitions (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000). Through this very participation individuals receive gratification and a sense of purpose or duty (Brabham 2010).

An effective social media presence has become necessary to raise awareness and engage citizens (particularly younger users) who may otherwise not be cognizant of a particular ongoing project (Gerber et al. 2012). High levels of civic engagement and transparency have many positive benefits when it comes to building trust and social capital within and amongst the community and local government (Brito 2008; Mayer

and Kenter 2018). The increase in social capital can make the jobs of administrators easier, while promoting a more inclusive policy process (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; Mayer and Kenter 2015).

2.5. Multifaceted marketing approach

The need to promote a campaign cannot be overstated, and “aggressive marketing and public relations plans” are particularly critical in the early stages of crowdfunding projects (Brabham 2009, p. 256; Lambert and Schwienbacher 2010). Raising awareness is almost as critical as raising money, and the two often go hand in hand (Mayer 2018). As Brabham (2009) states “these tactics should include both mainstream marketing and public relations campaigns (e.g. press releases, paid advertising, public service announcements), as well as alternative strategies (e.g. viral marketing through social networking sites, guerilla marketing, image events)” (p. 256). By promoting the campaign through multiple media platforms, the goal is to create excitement for the project and to create a vibrant and active crowdfunding community as rapidly as possible (Brabham 2009; Hemer 2011). This can create a particular challenge for local government, often already operating in a constrained environment when compared to the private sector. Yet increasingly a growing number of resources are being allocated to digital and social media presence within the public sector, whether through in-house application or other innovative and collaborative relationships with external stakeholders (Mergel 2015a).

When done well, crowdfunding platforms “allow people to overcome offline barriers to market transactions... [and] reduce market frictions associated with geographic distance” (Agrawal et al. 2013, p. 3). Crowdfunding proposals are usually contained within a local jurisdiction. However, it is possible to expand the footprint of the initiative by engaging individuals who live outside of the area (such as former residents, philanthropic minded people, etc.) by executing a broad approach to the campaign and problem description (Baeck and Collins 2013). In this case, multi-faceted marketing approaches and social media campaigns can play a substantial role.

3. Methodology

3.1. Data collection

The data for the study are collected through the review of completed project documents and proposals from two prominent, American, civic crowdfunding platforms. Completed projects refer to those that have exhausted their funding duration, regardless of whether fully funded or not. In addition to the successfully funded project information, data have been collected from each platform on the indexed campaigns that failed to meet the funding threshold. These data allow for additional

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

comparison between characteristics of funded and unfunded campaigns as well as the likelihood of success of civic crowdfunding projects of different origins and in different regions. Additional demographic data have been collected from the United States Census Bureau (2016). The platform data were collected over the summer and fall of 2015 and utilize a sampling frame from April 2012 through November 2015. The beginning of this timeframe coincides with the passage of the JOBS Act and the easing of solicitation regulations in the United States. This analysis examines 225 project proposals made on the ioby and Citizinvestor platforms between 2012 and 2015.

4. Results

4.1. Community demographics

Community demographics provide additional context into the success of civic crowdfunding proposals. General demographics can be found below in Table 1, along with a break-down of project success by region, following in Table 2. The majority of project proposals and successes can be found in the northeast, particularly in the New York metropolitan area. The midwest and southern regions along with the west coast of the country are also fairly well represented, while the Great Plains and the rocky mountain region appear to be less popular with both proposals and overall project successes.

Beyond simply location, a number of local and regional demographic factors go into project success in a particular area. This includes the size of a jurisdiction in which the project is proposed. Prior research has found that the majority of donations come from within the proposal's jurisdiction (DeSisto, personal communication, January 22, 2016). There are a number of potential reasons why this may be, but it makes intuitive sense that the larger a jurisdiction in terms of population, the better chance at success it may have.

The 225 project proposals used in this analysis come from 159 unique jurisdictions across the country. These proposal jurisdictions range in population from 192 in Loma Mar, California to just over 101,000 citizens in a section of Brooklyn, New York. The mean population of a jurisdiction in which a proposal is offered is 39,458, and the standard deviation is 24,985; it is important to note that the population sizes in many cases do not reflect the overall size of a city but simply the specific

Table 1. Community demographics.

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Median household income	50,284.28	14,725.36	26,095.0	114,574.0
Median age	35.69	5.32	23.0	65.1
Poverty rate (Percentage)	21.33	6.51	2.1	39.8
Education (Percentage Population with Bachelor's Degree and Beyond)	33.06	9.96	5.1	76.4
Population	39,631.88	24,903.76	192	101,572

Table 2. Regional project success.

Region	Division	Fully funded projects	Total projects proposed	Percent successfully funded
West		14	28	50%
	Mountain Pacific	3	6	50%
South		11	22	50%
		35	64	55%
	South Atlantic	10	27	37%
Northeast	East South Central	21	29	72%
	West South Central	4	8	50%
		68	114	60%
	New England	4	10	40%
Midwest	Mid-Atlantic	64	104	62%
		10	19	53%
	East North Central	8	16	50%
	West North Central	2	3	67%

Regional and divisional classification from the United States Census Bureau

jurisdiction within a proposing city (See Table 1). For example, proposals originating in Brooklyn come from an area of more than 100,000 citizens despite Brooklyn being located within the domain of New York City, which has a population of more than 8 million. The focus on the local jurisdiction as opposed to the city is done in order to utilize a more precise measure of population where projects are being proposed (Table 3).

Surprisingly, the number of proposals drops off as localities get larger; potentially suggesting that there is less need in larger populations for the types of projects prevalent on civic crowdfunding platforms than there are in smaller population segments where resources may be fewer or more constrained. Despite the drop in

Table 3. Success rate by population.

Population	Fully funded proposals	Success rate
0–10,000	12	60%
10,001–20,000	20	57%
20,001–30,000	23	53%
30,001–40,000	19	54%
40,001–50,000	13	50%
50,001–60,000	19	76%
60,001–70,000	2	22%
70,001–80,000	6	55%
80,001–90,000	5	50%
90,001–100,000	2	66%
100,001–110,000	6	75%

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

overall project proposals as population numbers increase, the success rates remain strong in the larger jurisdictions signifying that civic crowdfunding may perhaps be an underutilized resource in larger communities. Despite these surface conclusions, there was found to be no statistically significant difference between population segments and project success ($Chi^2(10) = 10.25, p = 0.42$).

The concern that civic crowdfunding may be simply a tool of community action for the wealthy does not really bear out when examining median household income by proposing jurisdictions (see Table 4). When looking at the median household income across proposal jurisdiction the mean is \$50,284.28, with a standard deviation of \$14,725.36 and a range between \$26,095 and \$114,574 (see Table 1 above). The vast majority of fully funded proposals come from jurisdictions where the median household income is between \$20,001 and \$60,000. Broken down further, the lowest median household income bracket to register, \$20,001 to \$40,000 has fully funded 33 project proposals with a 60% success rate. The next bracket, \$40,001 to \$60,000 has fully funded 79 proposals, with a 57% success rate while no other income bracket has more than four fully funded project proposals. A chi-square test examining the project success dependent variable found a lack of statistical difference between median household income levels and project success ($Chi^2(5) = 5.22, p = 0.16$). The results suggest that at the surface level, civic crowdfunding proposal success would seem to be a middle class endeavor, yet there is little that truly distinguishes one income bracket from the next when related to project success.

For further insight into community demographics and the role they play in participation and project success, we examine the community poverty rate within proposing jurisdictions and compare it with the other capacity measures detailed above. The poverty rate variable measures the percentage of the proposing jurisdictions population that is living under the federally established poverty line of \$24,300 for a family of four in 2016 (HealthCare.gov 2016).

The mean poverty rate within the analyzed jurisdictions is 21% with a standard deviation of 6.5 and a range of 2.1% in East Grand Rapids, Michigan to 39.8% in Detroit, Michigan (see Table 1). Grouping the proposing jurisdictions into increasing 5% poverty rate brackets reveals that the vast majority of project proposals come from jurisdictions with poverty rates between 20 and 30% (see Table 5) ($Chi^2(7) = 10.71, p =$

Table 4. Success rate by median household income.

Median household income (In USD)	Fully funded proposals	Success rate
0–20,000	0	0
20,001–40,000	33	60%
40,001–60,000	79	57%
60,001–80,000	4	29%
80,001–100,000	2	40%
100,001–120,000	3	60%

Table 5. Success rate by poverty rate within proposal jurisdictions.

Poverty rate	Fully funded proposals	Success rate
0–5%	2	50%
5.1–10%	5	42%
10.1–15%	3	25%
15.1–20%	6	40%
20.1–25%	71	60%
25.1–30%	28	65%
30.1–35%	3	38%
35.1–40%	3	60%

0.15). For comparison, the national poverty rate in 2014 was 14.8% (United States Census Bureau 2016). Yet within this threshold, projects are also quite likely to be fully funded with a success rate between 60 and 65%. Once again the sheer number of project proposals in New York City, New York and to a lesser extent Memphis, Tennessee exerts a substantial amount of influence on the total numbers in Table 5. Each city has a poverty rate well over the national average, yet when excluding the two cities from this table, the results look rather similar with the 20.1–25% bracket still being the most proposed and funded while being followed closely by the 25.1–30% bracket.

When taken collectively with the other community demographic measures, these results illustrate a portrait of the communities that propose and fund civic crowdfunding campaigns. These communities are often medium sized with populations of up to 60,000 citizens. Community affluence plays a part in project success as evidenced by median housing value, but success is certainly not limited to just the affluent jurisdictions. The near 60% proposal success rates in communities where the median household income is between \$20,001 and \$60,000 (see Table 5) highlights a point that is further solidified by the frequency with which projects are proposed and fully funded in areas above the national poverty rate, highlighting the idea that civic crowdfunding projects may be filling a critical community need gap.

5. Conclusions

5.1. Discussion

This study provides insight into the dynamics of civic crowdfunding projects, what they look like and where they work; which in turn further provides information on how to best utilize civic crowdfunding campaigns within local jurisdictions. Specifically by reviewing and synthesizing the growing literature and collecting and analyzing data from two of the largest civic crowdfunding platforms we are able to better understand the characteristics of community in civic crowdfunding. By examining both project successes and failures, as well community demographics, we can begin to illustrate the types of communities where civic crowdfunding projects are being utilized and where they are succeeding in the coproduction of goods and services.

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

Perhaps the most interesting finding is the information the analysis provides about how and where projects are funded. It is not as simple as the more affluent and involved an area is, the more likely project success is. The results confirmed no significant difference between income brackets in the proposing jurisdiction and their relationship to project success. Despite the general results, more sophisticated statistical testing is necessary to make definitive conclusions.

Equally surprising was the distribution of project proposals skewed heavily toward smaller cities, suggesting that there is perhaps a greater resource need being met by civic crowdfunding projects in smaller localities than exists in their larger counterparts. Ultimately, the analysis highlights that community matters in project success, and better understanding community demographics will allow for a greater understanding of project proposal success.

Collectively, the findings raise questions about the population characteristics of proposing jurisdictions. The more affluent communities may have larger budgets and other resources at their disposal to fund the types of projects typically proposed through civic crowdfunding platforms whereas the jurisdictions on the other end of the financial spectrum may lack the necessary resources to get even a crowdfunding project off the ground. The smaller, middle class areas in many cases exhibit a greater sense of project need than the more affluent proposing jurisdictions, but still retain enough collective resources to meet funding goals.

While the findings highlight community dynamics and population characteristics of proposals across the two analyzed platforms; to truly begin to generalize results, additional source material needs to be collected and analyzed. The lack of available data and the disparate information recorded and retained across platforms is a particular challenge that limits the ability to compare results across platforms and generalize across the entire research community.

Civic crowdfunding initiatives have continued to grow, joining a number of alternative funding and service delivery mechanisms designed to better connect citizens and communities with much needed resources. This study is one of the first that provides valuable insight into what these projects look like and where they work. By better understanding community dynamics and the demographics of civic crowdfunding, scholars are better equipped to begin to build a typology of successful civic crowdfunding predictors, which can then be used to provide direction on how to best utilize civic crowdfunding campaigns within local government. By examining both project successes and failures, as well community demographics, this study begins to illustrate the types of communities where innovative financing is taking place and, perhaps most importantly, working.

5.2. Implications

The results of this study offer a number of interesting findings and implications that further the burgeoning field and literature, particularly as it relates to explaining connections that link individuals through the use of innovative technology to local

government. This research highlights how online platforms can leverage citizen networks to provide goods and services within local communities through coproduction and collaboration. The research also highlights how new methods of engagement may be incorporated into local government organizations and illustrates the number of actors, both governmental and nongovernmental, that are required for successful integration and development.

By highlighting the impact and relative successes of civic crowdfunding proposals, this study illustrates the importance of designing meaningful public participation processes. Designing structures to balance challenges and operationalize and facilitate engagement are thus critical to take advantage of the resources of the crowd (Demediuk et al. 2012). Better understanding community dynamics and how they may influence project success can ultimately lead to better decision making from local government administrators when deciding whether to utilize civic crowdfunding in their localities. Administrators must ultimately determine whether civic crowdfunding is an opportunity that can positively impact their communities or whether it is a threat to their view of government. Community participation in government is almost universally praised as a more democratic and effective policy making tool, yet as Irvin and Stansbury (2004) state “incorporating citizen input into agency decision making is not a costless process” (pp. 55–56).

5.3. Contributions to the literature

This research contributes to the small, but steadily growing literature on civic crowdfunding as one of the first studies to analyze project proposals. This work builds on prior studies and provides examples and analysis that identifies several community demographics that correlate with project success and failure. Further, this work highlights the potential impacts that civic crowdfunding campaigns can have within a community particularly as it relates to service delivery and citizen engagement.

Much of the early crowdfunding literature is purely empirical observation and calls for additional grounding of the emerging field. This research begins to stitch together the early crowdfunding literature while incorporating research on engagement, collaboration, and the coproduction of goods and services in an effort to inform the field and provide perspective with regard to the community dynamics of civic crowdfunding participation. Further, this study is one of the first to collect and analyze data from several platforms in an effort to begin to move the field beyond case study research and begin to be able to examine results from a broad swath of proposed projects.

5.4. Future research

The purpose of this study is to examine and better understand the community dynamics of civic crowdfunding participation; specifically where projects are

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

proposed and what conditions may impact participation. Future research opportunities in this domain are many.

Further examining population size and community demographics and their impact on project success and failure would provide an interesting avenue for future research as well as valuable insight into the characteristics influencing participation and project success. This approach would also allow for additional insight into the impact regional differences and community demographics have on project success. Finally, collecting additional data across several platforms internationally would further increase generalizability and allow for the accounting and control of several impactful factors not yet measured or discussed in this analysis.

References

- Ajay Agrawal, Christian Catalini, and Avi Goldfarb (2013). Crowdfunding: Social frictions in the Flat World? *NEBR working paper 16820*.
- Baack, Peter and Liam Collins (2013). *Working the Crowd: A Short Guide to Crowdfunding and How it Can Work for You*. London, UK: Nesta.
- Belleflamme, Paul, Thomas Lambert, and Armin Schwiendbacher (2013). Crowdfunding: Tapping the Right Crowd. *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 585-609.
- Bingham, Lisa Blomgren, Tina Nabatchi, and Rosemary O'Leary (2005). The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 547-558.
- Bovaird, Tony (2007). Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 846-860.
- Brabham, Darren C. (2009). Crowdsourcing the Public Participation Process for Planning Projects. *Planning Theory*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 242-262.
- Brabham, Darren C. (2010). Moving the Crowd at Threadless: Motivations for Participation in a Crowdsourcing Application. *Information, Communication & Society*, vol. 13, no. 8, pp. 1122-1145.
- Brabham, Darren C. (2013). *Crowdsourcing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Branden, Taco and Victor Pestoff (2006). Co-Production, the Third Sector and the Delivery of Public Services: An Introduction. *Public Management Review*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 493-501.
- Brito, Jerry. (2008). Improving Government Transparency Online. *Public Manager*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 22-26.
- Brudney, Jeffrey L. and Robert E. England (1983). Toward a Definition of the Coproduction Concept. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 59-65.
- Bryson, John M., Barbara C. Crosby, and Laura Bloomberg (2014). Public Value Governance: Moving Beyond Traditional Public Administration and the New Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 445-456.
- Clark, Benjamin Y., Nicholas Zingale, Joseph Logan, and Jeffrey Brudney (2016). A Framework for Using Crowdsourcing in Government. *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 57-75.
- Davies, Rodrigo (2014). *Civic Crowdfunding: Participatory Communities, Entrepreneurs and the Political Economy of Place*. Graduate thesis. MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Demediuk, Peter, Rolf Solli, and Petra Adolfsson. (2012). People Plan Their Park: Voice and Choice Through Participatory Budgeting. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 185-198.

- Denhardt, Robert and Janet Denhardt (2000). The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 549-559.
- DeSisto, Tony (2016). Personal Communication, 22 January 2016.
- Dixon, J., and Dogan, R. (2002). Hierarchies, networks and markets: responses to societal governance failure. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 175-196.
- Estellés-Arolas, Enrique and Fernando González-Ladrón-de-Guevara (2012). Towards an Integrated Crowdsourcing Definition. *Journal of Information Science*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 189-200.
- Gerber, Elizabeth M., Julie S. Hui, and Pei-Yi Kuo. (2012). *Crowdfunding: Why People are Motivated to Post and Fund Projects on Crowdfunding Platforms*. In Proceedings of the International Workshop on Design, Influence, and Social Technologies: Techniques, Impacts and Ethics. Pp. 1-10.
- Griffin, Zachary. (2012). Crowdfunding: Fleecing the American Masses. *Case Western Reserve Journal of Law, Technology & the Internet*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 375-421.
- HealthCare.gov. (2016). Federal poverty level. <https://www.healthcare.gov/glossary/federal-poverty-level-FPL>. Accessed July 1, 2016.
- Hemer, Joachim. (2011). A Snapshot on Crowdfunding. *Working papers firms and region*, vol. R2/2011, pp. 1-44.
- Howe, Jeff. (2006). The Rise of Crowdsourcing. *Wired Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 1-4.
- Howe, Jeff. (2008). *Crowdsourcing: How the Power of the Crowd is Driving the Future of Business*. New York, NY, Random House Publishing.
- Irvin, Renee A. and John Stansbury (2004). Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 55-65.
- Jordan, Meagan, Juita-Elena Yusuf, Martin Mayer, and Kaitrin Mahar. (2016). What Citizens Want to Know About Their Government's Finances: Closing the Information Gap. *The Social Science Journal*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 301-308.
- Kettl, D. F. (2002). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for twenty-first century America*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.
- Lambert, Thomas and Armin Schwienbacher (2010). An Empirical Analysis of Crowdfunding. *Social Science Research Network*, vol. 1578175, pp. 1-23.
- Lindsay, Drew. (2015). Local Governments and Non-Profits Test Crowdfunding for Civic Projects. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. <https://philanthropy.com/article/Local-Governments-and/152005>
- Mayer, Martin (2016). *Civic Crowdfunding and Local Government: An Examination into Projects, Scope, and Implications for Local Government*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia.
- Mayer, Martin (2018). "Crowdfunding and Social Policy" in Farazmand (Ed.), *The Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration*. New York, New York: Springer Reference.
- Mayer, Martin and Robert Kenter (2015). "The Prevailing Elements of Public-Sector Collaboration" in Morris and Miller-Stevens (eds), *Advancing Collaboration Theory: Models, Typologies, and Evidence*. New York, New York: Routledge Press.
- Mayer, Martin and Robert Kenter (2018). "Public Sector Collaboration and Social Policy" in Farazmand (Ed.), *The Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration*, Springer Reference.
- Mergel, Ines (2015a). Open Collaboration in the Public Sector: The Case of Social Coding on GitHub. *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 464-472.
- Mergel, Ines (2015b). Opening Government: Designing Open Innovation Processes to Collaborate with External Stakeholders. *Social Science Computer Review*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 599-612.
- Mergel, Ines and Kevin Desouza, (2013). Implementing Open Innovation in the Public Sector: The Case of Challenge.gov. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 73, no. 6, pp. 882-890.
- Miglietta, Angelo, Emanuele Parisi, Matteo Pessione, and Flavio Servato (2014). *CrowdFunding and Local Governments: A Financial Opportunity for a New Liaison with Citizens*. In *Conference*

Examining Community Dynamics of Civic Crowdfunding Participation

- Proceedings, 16th Toulon-Verona Conference "Excellence in Services"*. University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, pp. 485-495.
- Milward, H. B., and Provan, K. G. (2000). Governing the hollow state. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, vol. 10, no 2, pp. 359-380.
- Mollick, Ethan. (2014). The Dynamics of Crowdfunding: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Noveck, Beth S. (2009). *Wiki Government: How Technology Can Make Government Better, Democracy Stronger, and Citizens More Powerful*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Robbins, Mark D., and Bill Simonsen. (2002). A Dynamic Method of Citizen Preference Revelation. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting, and Financial Management*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 445-462.
- Seltzer, Ethan, and Dillon Mahmoudi. (2012). Citizen Participation, Open Innovation, and Crowdsourcing: Challenges and Opportunities for Planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 3-18.
- Stoker, Gerry. (2006). Public Value Management a New Narrative for Networked Governance? *The American Review of Public Administration*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 41-57.
- United States Census Bureau. (2016). Poverty. <https://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty.html>. Accessed August 18, 2016.
- Zuckerman, Ethan. (2014). New Media, New Civics? *Policy & Internet*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 151-168.