

CROWDFUNDING FOR NON-COMMERCIAL INITIATIVES

Кабылко Е. Краудфандинг для некоммерческих инициатив. Краудфандинг как альтернативный способ привлечения средств населения посредством сети Интернет через специальные площадки набирает популярность во всем мире. Некоммерческий характер проекта является одной из ключевых предпосылок достижения положительного результата. Цель данной работы – проверка применимости тенденций, выявленных исследователями, к некоммерческим проектам и проектам, имеющим социальную направленность, которые были размещены на белорусской краудфандинговой платформе Ulej.

Crowdfunding is the practice of funding a project or venture by raising many small amounts of money from a large number of people, typically via the Internet [1]. There are three participants in crowdfunding process: founder (fundraiser, creator, initiator, entrepreneur), funder (sponsor, backer, investor) and crowdfunding platform. With respect to the nature of outcome crowdfunding could be donation-, equity-, debt-, and rewards-based. For financing non-commercial projects only the last two. Crowdfunding campaign starts with choice of platform and description of the idea.

Fundraising is one of the main activities of non-profit organizations. These organizations seek sustainable development as for-profits and they should diversify funds [2]. Sponsors contributing to such projects are driven by empathy towards the cause. Read [3] states that supporters use crowdfunding for the feelings of social benefit. However he recommended non-profits to use material rewards to express how the funds were allocated.

Hörisch [4] with respect to contract failure theory stating that due to shift of focus from gaining profit to the quality of results, non-commercial initiatives have an advantage in attracting public, declared that non-profit campaigns are more effective in acquiring contributions. Lambert and Schwienbacher [5] performed the research and concluded that non-profit initiatives are more successful in fund collection. Their findings were checked by Pitschner and Pitschner-Finn [6], handling data from Kickstarter. The indices used for evaluation are average amount received per sponsor, total number of sponsors, total funds raised in percentage, prob-

ability of collection of desired amount. Meanwhile there was emphasis on points of possible difference between commercial and non-commercial initiatives in the amounts desired, minimum pledge, extent of presentation of project on platform and duration of campaign. Results achieved after analysis show that meanwhile non-profit projects demonstrate better performance in achieving funding aims and average value of pledge per sponsor is higher, for-profits on average collect bigger sums and attract more funders.

Meanwhile, Elmer [7] stated that many non-profit projects ended up reaching not more than 17 percent of funding goal, therefore organization could be more effective in collecting money at an event than during crowdfunding campaign. Nevertheless Messina [8] pointed that in case of emergency non-profits should turn to crowdfunding, underlining that in 2013 approximately one third part of funds raised globally were collected within socially important campaigns.

As for crowdfunding industry in Belarus the sector started to develop in 2011. Nowadays there are 2 crowdfunding platforms (MaeSens and Ulej) and 1 – dealing both with crowdfunding and crowdsourcing (Talak). In 2015 total volume of contributions in Belarus equaled to 3,069 billion BYR or approximately 165 300 US dollars [9].

Belarusian reward-based crowdfunding platform Ulej is analogue to the American Kickstarter. This site was chosen for analysis because it is the first site of that kind in the Republic of Belarus. Fundraising mechanism established on the platform is “All-or-Nothing”. Platform began to work on April, 2015.

To the analyzed sample there were included 74 project finished till 15.03.2016 from 10 categories (other categories were excluded because they did not have any successful campaigns).

The objective of the work is to test the following research hypothesis:

H₁: Non-commercial initiatives are more successful in collecting funds than commercial projects;

H₂: Campaigns belonging to the category Social projects are more successful in fundraising than others.

As for the distribution of positive and negative results of crowdfunding campaigns between commercial and non-commercial initiatives sample consisted of 42 projects aimed at getting profit after project realization and 32 projects with the non-profit targets. 47 % of non-commercial projects and 38 % of commercial projects reached stated fi-

nancial goals. The quantity of fails among commercial initiatives 1,6 times exceeded the number of non-failed ones, while for non-commercial the corresponding ratio is 1,1.

Social projects composed 22 % of the sample, half of them ended successfully. At the same time amid the rest of the campaigns 40 % reached set financial goals.

For testing research hypothesis logistic regression was applied. For the analyzed data H_1 and H_2 are not corroborated, non-commercial initiatives are not more successful in fund collection then commercial projects and campaigns belonging to the category Social projects are not more successful in fundraising than other ones. Such results could be associated with short period of functioning of the crowdfunding platform Ulej and a comparatively small number of posted projects.

Literature:

1 Profatilov, D.A. Crowdfunding: Online Charity or a Modern Tool for Innovative Projects Implementation? / D.A. Profatilov, O.N. Bykova, M.O. Olkhovskaya // Asian Social Science. – 2015. – № 11. – P. 146–151.

2 Gathuo, S. Are Nonprofits Obsolete? / S. Gathuo // American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. – 2015. – №3. – P. 62–69.

3 Read, A. Crowdfunding: An Empirical and Theoretical Model of Non-Profit Support [Electronic resource] / A. Read – 2013. – Mode of access: http://soundideas.pugetsound.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1098&context=economics_theses. – Date of access: 08.02.2016.

4 Hörisch, J. Crowdfunding for environmental ventures: an empirical analysis of the influence of environmental orientation on the success of crowdfunding initiatives. / J. Hörisch // Journal of cleaner production. – 2015. – №107. – P. 636–645.

5 Lambert, T. An empirical analysis of crowdfunding [Electronic resource] / T. Lambert, A. Schwenbacher. – 2010. – Mode of access: <http://www.crowdsourcing.org/document/an-empirical-analysis-of-crowdfunding-/2458>. – Date of access: 09.02.2016.

6 Pitschner, S. Non-profit differentials in crowd-based financing: Evidence from 50,000 campaigns. / S. Pitschner, S. Pitschner-Finn // Economic Letters. – 2014. – № 123. – P. 391–394.

7 Elmer, V. In crowdfunding, no such thing as free money [Electronic resource] / V. Elmer. – 2014. – Mode of access

:<http://www.craigslistdetroit.com/article/20141026> /NEWS/310269926/in-crowdfunding-no-such-thing-as-free-money. – Date of access: 28.05.2016.

8 Messina, J. Charities turn to Web to get cash [Electronic resource] / J. Messina – 2014. – Mode of access: <http://www.craigslistnewyork.com/article/20141021/NONPROFITS/310199999/charities-turn-to-web-to-get-cash>. – Date of access: 28.05.2016.

9 Быковский, П. Краудфандинг: право выбирать будущее [Электронный ресурс] / П. Быковский – Режим доступа: <http://director.by/index.php/arhiv-nomerov/-2016/163--2016/4529-2016-02-12-08-05-04.html>. – Дата доступа: 29.04.2016.

А.И. Каврус

*УО «Белорусский государственный технологический университет»
(Республика Беларусь, Минск)*

УСТОЙЧИВЫЙ ТУРИЗМ КАК ИНСТРУМЕНТ РЕГИОНАЛЬНОГО РАЗВИТИЯ

В последние годы в отечественной и зарубежной научной литературе все чаще используется такое понятие как «устойчивый туризм», в то время как в законодательстве Республики Беларусь данный термин до сих пор отсутствует.

В отличие от схожих понятий (экологического туризма, природного туризма, сельского туризма и пр.), устойчивый туризм представляет собой совокупность норм и правил управления на принципах устойчивого развития, применимую ко всем видам туристической деятельности, в том числе к упомянутым выше видам туризма. Цели устойчивого туризма включают улучшение охраны природного и культурного наследия, повышение уровня жизни местных сообществ в сельских районах и в зонах, примыкающих к охраняемым территориям, а также стимулирование познания и бережного отношения к природе, культуре коренных народов, биологическому разнообразию и культурному наследию туристических дестинаций [1].

Наиболее эффективной формой организации устойчивого туризма для условий Беларуси является агрозкотуризм («временное