Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management

Publisher: IEOM Society International, USA DOI: 10.46254/IN05.20250279
Published: November 6, 2025

Platform-Enabled Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: A Data-Driven Framework for Innovation and Sustainable Startup Growth

Mohd Tabrej Alam and Rudra Prakash Pradhan
Vinod Gupta School of Management
Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur
West Bengal, India
mohammadtabrej@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in, rudrap@vgsom.iitkgp.ac.in

Abstract

The paper focuses on how the digital platforms have been transformational in bolstering the entrepreneur ecosystems through empowering innovation, facilitating access to funds, and connecting the world in entrepreneurial networks. The study, which is carried out using a mixed-methods design that combines a semi-structured interviewing technique, survey instrument, secondary data, and case study application, assesses the contribution of Kickstarter, LinkedIn, Slack, Trello, AngelList, and Y Combinator to the performance of startups. According to descriptive, regression, and correlation analysis, it is shown that the biggest determinant of how much revenue a company can generate is global networking, followed by innovation progress and the ability to secure funds. Crowdfunding tools grant easier access to the capital, collaboration platforms encourage operational efficiency, and the network-building platforms eliminate the geographical barriers so that the market is scalable. Issues of platform dependency, data security risks, and the digital divide, however, still exist, especially among nations that are not well represented. The results highlight the interdependence of such factors as connectivity, innovation, and financing in terms of facilitating sustainable startup scaling, which can guide policymakers, ecosystem managers, and entrepreneurs with feasible suggestions. Grounded in Resource-Based View, Network Theory, and Dynamic Capabilities, this paper extends existing models by introducing the Platform-Enabled Resource-Network Advantage (PRNA) framework that captures how startups dynamically reconfigure resources through digital interaction. The paper recommends the balanced synthesis of digital networking and the traditional ecosystem criteria to enhance an inclusive approach, resilience, and sustainability of entrepreneurial endeavours.

Keywords

Digital platforms, Entrepreneurial ecosystems, Startup growth, Global networking, Crowdfunding, Ecosystem resilience.

1. Introduction

In the last ten years, digital platforms have changed how new businesses come up with ideas, get money, organize themselves, and grow. This has made platform participation a key strategic tool in today's entrepreneurial ecosystems (Gawer, 2022; Parker, Van Alstyne, & Choudary, 2016). Platforms like Kickstarter, LinkedIn, AngelList (Wellfound), Slack, Trello, and accelerator communities (like Y Combinator) are more than just simple tools. They are market infrastructures that connect entrepreneurs with capital, knowledge, talent, and customers faster and more widely than ever before (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014; Mollick, 2014; Sorenson et al., 2016). At the same time, policy discussions are increasingly framing regional ecosystems as complicated, interdependent systems in which networks, institutions, and digital infrastructures evolve together to help businesses start and grow (Isenberg, 2011; Stam, 2015). We still don't have a complete, comparative picture of which platform-enabled mechanisms have the biggest impact on startup performance and how they all work together to help businesses grow in a sustainable way, even though platform-

centric practices are spreading quickly. We have addressed the identified gap by proposing and empirically investigating the hypothesis that three platform-enabled pillars—global networking, innovation advancement, and the capacity to secure funding—collectively influence startup outcomes, with global networking having the most significant impact on revenue growth. We base our research on the Resource-Based View (RBV), Network Theory, and the Dynamic Capabilities perspective. RBV stresses the importance of valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable assets for gaining an edge (Barney, 1991), but new businesses usually don't have a lot of resources. Digital platforms mitigate this scarcity by providing on-demand access to external capital (e.g., crowdfunding backers, angel syndicates), talent, and complementary assets without ownership (Mollick, 2014; Parker et al., 2016). Network theory elucidates the significance of one's connections, particularly the diversity and structural uniqueness of those ties, in influencing opportunity identification, information dissemination, and performance (Burt, 1992; Granovetter, 1973).

Platform-mediated networks enhance the reach of weak ties across geographies and sectors, thereby augmenting exposure to unique knowledge and facilitating market access (Gawer, 2022; Parker et al., 2016). Dynamic capabilities explain how businesses find opportunities, take advantage of them by using resources, and change their structures in unstable situations. Platforms speed up these processes by shortening the time it takes to search, coordinate, and learn (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997; Teece, 2007).Empirical evidence indicates that crowdfunding can democratize early-stage financing and signal venture quality to subsequent investors (Mollick, 2014; Sorenson et al., 2016), that accelerators enhance access to expert mentors, investor networks, and market legitimacy (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014), and that digitally enabled collaboration reduces feedback loops and time-to-market (Leonardi, 2014). Most studies, on the other hand, look at these mechanisms separately, which leaves open the question of which one has more of an effect. For example, does network reach have a bigger effect on revenue than capital access, or does innovation momentum have a bigger effect when coordination frictions are low? Moreover, there is a scarcity of comprehensive integration that connects platform-enabled resource access, network structure, and adaptive processes into a unified explanatory model specifically designed for early-stage ventures.

We propose the Platform-Enabled Resource-Network Advantage (PRNA) framework to address these limitations. PRNA sees platforms as having two main roles: (a) they are resource pools that add to or replace internal resource bases (RBV), and (b) they are network amplifiers that make relational structures denser and more diverse (Network Theory). At the same time, they are (c) accelerators of reconfiguration that improve sensing, seizing, and transforming routines (dynamic capabilities) (Barney, 1991; Burt, 1992; Teece, 2007). In PRNA, startup performance depends on the interdependence of connectivity (global networking), innovation progress (the rate and scope of new offerings), and financing capability (the ability to get capital quickly). Platforms lower the costs of searching, matching, and coordinating across all three (Gawer, 2022; Parker et al., 2016). We assert that enterprises that attain significant platform-facilitated global networking experience disproportionate revenue increases due to boundary-spanning connections that broaden market reach, diminish customer acquisition barriers, and stimulate complementary exchanges of knowledge and capital (Burt, 1992; Granovetter, 1973). At the same time, growth based on platforms makes things more vulnerable. Relying on third-party infrastructures puts businesses at risk of policy, algorithm, and fee changes that are out of their control. This is known as platform risk, and it can quickly change how demand is found or how channels are accessed (Cutolo & Kenney, 2021; Parker et al., 2016). Using more cloud-based and API-integrated tools makes data privacy and security threats more likely (Leonardi, 2014). Lastly, the fact that broadband access, digital literacy, and institutional support are still not equal means that many founders, especially those in areas that are not well represented, have structural barriers that prevent them from fully using platform affordances. This makes the digital divide in entrepreneurial opportunity even bigger (van Dijk, 2020; Isenberg, 2011). Consequently, any integrative assessment must evaluate both capability enhancements and systemic risks, in addition to inclusion factors for ecosystem design.

This study aims to make three contributions. First, it measures how much platform-enabled global networking, innovation progress, and financing capability affect startup revenue. It shows that global networking is the best predictor, while innovation and funding are still important (Burt, 1992; Teece, 2007). Second, it combines RBV, network theory, and dynamic capabilities into the PRNA framework. This makes it clearer how platforms turn external connections and resources into adaptive advantage (Barney, 1991; Teece et al., 1997). Third, it qualifies these benefits by outlining the risks of platform dependency, security, and inclusion, which gives entrepreneurs, ecosystem stewards, and policymakers who want resilient and fair scaling useful advice (Cutolo & Kenney, 2021; van Dijk, 2020). In conclusion, we contend that digital platforms are not merely supplementary tools but integral components of

contemporary entrepreneurial ecosystems. By empirically ranking their primary mechanisms and theorizing their interdependence through PRNA, we establish a coherent foundation for strategy and policy: cultivate globally diverse professional networks early, enhance those connections through ongoing product innovation, and utilize platform-mediated finance judiciously—while mitigating dependency and inclusion risks through multi-channel engagement and capability development (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014; Gawer, 2022; Teece, 2007).

1.1 Objectives

This study addresses the enduring deficiency in integrated evidence regarding the collective impact of platform-enabled mechanisms—global networking, innovation advancement, and funding capacity—on startup performance, while recognizing associated risks such as platform dependency, data/security vulnerabilities, and the digital divide. Based on the Resource-Based View, Network Theory, and Dynamic Capabilities, our main goal is to measure and compare how these three pillars affect revenue (and growth), find out if global networking has the most significant effect when controls are taken into account, and look at how they work together in line with the proposed PRNA framework (Barney, 1991; Burt, 1992; Teece, 2007). Consequently, we aimed to estimate multivariate models with standardized coefficients to rank-order effects; to evaluate whether ventures that integrate platform types (funding + networking + collaboration/accelerator) surpass partial users; and to investigate whether innovation returns are enhanced when global networking is elevated—indicative of PRNA-style interdependence.

In line with this, we have set six clear, testable goals. First, we use OLS models with the right controls (team size, venture age, sector, and region) to figure out how much global networking, innovation progress, and funding capability affect startup revenue. We expect to see a clear rank order (β_networking > β_innovation > β_funding). Second, we assess the significance of global networking through formal coefficient-comparison tests to ascertain whether its marginal effect statistically surpasses those of innovation and funding. Third, we confirm PRNA complementarity by analyzing performance differences between high multi-platform users and others, as well as by investigating interaction terms (Innovation × Networking) to identify amplification effects. Fourth, we perform stringent hypothesis testing and robustness assessments, including alternative outcomes (growth), heteroskedasticity-robust errors, bootstrapped standard errors and multicollinearity diagnostics (VIF < 5), to guarantee reliability. Fifth, we use thematic analysis of interviews and cases to record platform risks and inclusion limits. We then use quantitative indicators to determine ways to reduce these risks. Finally, we turn important empirical levers into practical advice for entrepreneurs, ecosystem stewards, and policymakers to help them scale in a way that is both strong and open to everyone. This step connects quantitative results to real-world situations.

Operationally, performance is quantified through annual revenue (log-transformed) and one-year revenue growth; global networking is assessed as a composite of founder LinkedIn connections (log), geographic diversity of ties, and engagement in international communities/accelerators; innovation progress is evaluated as a composite of new products/features, percentage of revenue from recent offerings, and intellectual property events; and funding capability is measured by total external finance (log), crowdfunding outcomes, and perceived ease of fundraising (Mollick, 2014; Sorenson et al., 2016). The analyses evaluate the principal hypotheses that networking, innovation, and funding each positively correlate with revenue; that the standardized effect of networking is the most substantial; and that multi-platform engagement and Innovation × Networking complementarities are linked to enhanced performance—thereby empirically substantiating and refining the PRNA mechanism (Barney, 1991; Burt, 1992; Teece, 2007).

2. Literature Review

Digital platforms have transformed entrepreneurship from a firm-centric approach to an ecosystemic orchestration, wherein founders, users, and complementors generate value through software-mediated interactions that reduce the costs of search, matching, and coordination (Gawer, 2022; Nambisan, 2017; Parker, Van Alstyne, & Choudary, 2016). In this digital entrepreneurial ecosystem, platforms act as market infrastructure devices by grouping together reputation systems, discovery algorithms, and rule sets. They decide which businesses obtain attention and traction, often separating opportunity from location and asset ownership (Kenney & Zysman, 2016; Sussan & Acs, 2017). This reframing changes platform participation from a choice of channel to a strategic tool for getting resources, building legitimacy, and growing quickly (Autio, Nambisan, Thomas, & Wright, 2018). The first stream explains how crowdfunding expands early-stage finance while also sending signals to the market. Campaigns on sites like Kickstarter and other similar sites that offer rewards and equity not only encourage people to invest money that is spread out, but they also show demand through pre-purchase commitments, updates, and social proof (Mollick, 2014; Roma, Messeni Petruzzelli, & Perrone, 2017). Successful campaigns at the regional level are linked to later

investments in new businesses, which suggests that they have an effect on the local finance ecosystem (Sorenson, Assenova, Li, Boada, & Samila, 2016). But the project's quality isn't the only factor; the founders' communication skills and network structure also affect the results (Mollick, 2014). A second stream emphasizes professional networking and accelerator-mediated connectivity as catalysts for scope expansion and legitimacy. Network theory posits that weak ties and brokerage across structural holes produce unique information, expedite opportunity identification, and enhance performance (Burt, 1992; Granovetter, 1973).

Digital professional platforms (e.g., LinkedIn, AngelList/Wellfound) enhance these mechanisms by expanding cross-border, cross-industry connections and reducing matching frictions with mentors, partners, customers, and investors (Autio et al., 2018; Parker et al., 2016). Accelerators like Y Combinator and Techstars, on the other hand, focus on building strong networks of mentors and investors. Studies have shown that these networks can help with fundraising, growth, and survival by helping people learn, choose, and legitimize their networks (Cohen & Hochberg, 2014; Hochberg, 2016). A third stream links collaboration tools to the speed of innovation and how well an organization learns. Digital communication and project management tools (like Slack, Trello, and Git-centric workflows) make work more visible, speed up coordination, and make it easier to make changes quickly. These are all micro foundations that fit with the dynamic capability's perspective (Leonardi, 2014; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997; Teece, 2007). For resource-constrained, distributed startups, these affordances reduce feedback loops and time-to-market, especially when used with communities that are open to the public and provide constant user input and reputational signals (Autio et al., 2018; Nambisan, 2017). When you put them all together, funding platforms, networking infrastructures, and collaboration stacks seem to work well together. Connectivity increases the returns to innovation and capital by opening up new ways to distribute, partner, and learn.

A last stream warns that growth based on platforms can lead to problems with governance and inclusion. Using third-party infrastructures makes businesses vulnerable to changes in the rules, fees, and algorithms that can suddenly change how they obtain and make money (Cutolo & Kenney, 2021; Parker et al., 2016). Greater dependence on cloud ecosystems and APIs heightens data privacy and security vulnerabilities, with breach externalities that may diminish user trust (Leonardi, 2014). Furthermore, enduring disparities in broadband access, digital literacy, and institutional support inhibit participation from underrepresented regions and groups, jeopardizing the expansion of the digital divide in entrepreneurial opportunities (van Dijk, 2020; Isenberg, 2011; Stam, 2015). Combining these literatures shows that there is both overlap and a big gap: most studies only look at one mechanism at a time. This study tackles the issue by combining the Resource-Based View, Network Theory, and Dynamic Capabilities into a single Platform-Enabled Resource–Network Advantage framework. It also compares the effects of global networking, innovation progress, and funding capability on startup performance while taking into account governance and inclusion constraints (Barney, 1991; Burt, 1992; Teece, 2007).

3. Methods

This research utilizes a convergent explanatory design that emphasizes quantitative inference and theory testing while systematically aligning constructs with theory-driven measurement models. The methodological rationale is to assess the relative impact of three platform-enabled pillars—global networking, innovation advancement, and funding capacity—on startup performance, while also examining the complementarities anticipated by the PRNA framework. We analytically establish a foundational multivariate model for firm performance, alongside a series of extended models to evaluate coefficient rank ordering, interactions, and robustness, in accordance with current standards for model diagnostics and inference (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2019; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). Operationalization and preprocessing are based on theory-consistent composite indices that use a 0–100 scale.

Startup performance is measured by (a) annual revenue (log-transformed for normality) and (b) one-year revenue growth in sensitivity analyses. The Global Networking Index combines the size of a founder's network (the log of their professional connections), the variety of ties they have (the normalized Blau-type index), and their participation in international entrepreneurial communities and accelerators. The Innovation Progress Index combines the number of new products and features released in the last 24 months, the percentage of revenue from offerings launched in the last year, and the number of intellectual property milestones (filed or granted patents). The Funding Capability Index combines the total amount of external finance (log; crowdfunding + angel/VC), a binary indicator of successful crowdfunding, and the perceived ease of fundraising (5-point scale). All components are standardized (z-scores) and averaged using theoretically driven weights; internal consistency is confirmed (Cronbach's $\alpha \geq .70$). For monetary variables, inflation is taken into account when necessary; for continuous variables, the mean is used before interaction

tests; and for extreme values, winsorization checks at the 1st and 99th percentiles are used to look for undue leverage (Hair et al., 2019).

The main method of estimation is ordinary least squares (OLS) with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors. This method predicts log-revenue from the three main indices while taking into account team size, venture age, sector dummies, founding experience, and region. We present standardized coefficients (β) for direct comparison of effect sizes and employ Wald tests to determine if the networking coefficient significantly surpasses those of innovation and funding (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). To analyze PRNA complementarities, we estimate moderated regressions incorporating Innovation × Global Networking and calculate conditional effects through simple-slopes analyses utilizing bias-corrected bootstrapped confidence intervals (5,000 resamples) (Hayes, 2018). We also use t-tests/ANOVA to compare the average performance of "multi-platform utilizers" (those who use at least one platform in each of the funding, networking, and collaboration/accelerator categories) to that of other users to see how well they work together.

Tests for linearity, normality of residuals (Q–Q plots), and homoscedasticity (Breusch–Pagan) are all part of assumption checks and diagnostics. Variance inflation factors (VIF < 5 as acceptable) are used to keep an eye on multicollinearity. Influence diagnostics (Cook's distance, leverage) are examined; results are re-evaluated by omitting high-influence cases to guarantee stability. To mitigate potential common-method variance in composite measures, we diversify response formats across constructs, delineate predictor and outcome blocks within the analytical workflow, and perform post-hoc tests (Harman's single-factor, marker variable); no singular factor predominates the covariance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012).

4. Data Collection

Data were gathered through a convergent, multi-source methodology to achieve a balance between breadth and depth while reducing single-source bias. We focused on startups that had been around for at least two years and were focused on innovation (to see how they did). We found founders and executives through purposive and snowball sampling in global founder communities, accelerator alumni list, and professional groups on LinkedIn and AngelList. A structured online questionnaire collected standardized data on platform use (networking, collaboration, crowdfunding/angel/VC), innovation progress, funding capability, performance (annual revenue, growth), and controls (team size, age, sector, region, and founding experience). To improve validity and lessen common-method bias, predictor and outcome blocks were split up, item formats were changed (counts, Likert, binaries), and attention checks were added. A short pilot with founders and faculty helped make improvements. We checked self-reports against publicly available profiles/APIs to confirm that complementary secondary indicators like crowdfunding outcomes (e.g., Kickstarter pages), accelerator participation (public alumni lists), and limited investment/funding records were correct. We did semi-structured interviews (45–60 minutes) with a diverse group of founders to put mechanisms and risks (platform dependency, data/security, inclusion) into context. We also wrote two short case vignettes. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed, anonymized, and thematically coded. All participants gave their informed consent, and no personally identifiable information is reported. The data were stored on encrypted drives in line with institutional ethical standards.

5. Results and Discussion

The analysis reveals a distinct, hierarchical pattern: global networking emerges as the most significant predictor of startup performance, succeeded by innovation progress and subsequently by funding capability, even when accounting for venture age, team size, sector, and region. In standardized terms, networking has about twice as much effect on log-revenue as funding and a lot more than innovation. The overall model explains a big part of the revenue variance. In terms of description, platform adoption is widespread (professional networking, collaboration stacks, crowdfunding/angel networks), and the composites for networking, innovation, and funding show satisfactory internal consistency and only weak intercorrelations. This means that they measure different levers instead of just one "platform intensity" factor.

In addition to main effects, the results show that there are complementarities that fit with the PRNA logic. For example, the marginal return to innovation is higher when global networking is stronger, and ventures that use multiple platform types (funding + networking + collaboration/accelerator) make more money and grow faster than ventures that only use one platform type. Qualitative narratives corroborate the quantitative data—founders attributed boundary-

spanning connections to the establishment of export channels, prominent pilot projects, collaborative tools to the reduction of iteration cycles, and crowdfunding to both capital acquisition and market validation—collectively elucidating why connectivity often enhances the returns from innovation and finance rather than merely augmenting them. These findings contribute to a cohesive understanding of platform-enabled entrepreneurship: platforms enhance resource accessibility (RBV), strengthen and diversify weak-tie networks that broaden opportunity sets (Network Theory), and expedite the processes of sensing, seizing, and transforming routines that facilitate idea adoption (Dynamic Capabilities). In practice, the playbook is to build diverse professional networks around the world early on, make rapid, tool-enabled innovation cycles a part of the company culture, and use platform finance as a way to signal and raise awareness—not just as a way to get started—while protecting against relying on one platform by using multiple platforms, owning direct customer channels, and following basic vendor-risk and data-minimization practices.

Three caveats constrain interpretation. First, the cross-sectional design restricts causal assertions, necessitating longitudinal or quasi-experimental follow-ups (e.g., concerning platform policy shocks). Second, the partial reliance on self-report indicates that subsequent research should integrate platform telemetry and validated financial data to mitigate measurement error. Third, external validity is most robust for innovation-driven, digitally engaged enterprises; sector-specific replications and samples from the Global South would serve to evaluate boundary conditions. Still, the combination of quantitative and qualitative evidence backs up the main point: connectivity is the key to platform-enabled advantage, with innovation and finance as valuable extras. Scaling in a resilient and inclusive manner requires careful management of all three factors, while also monitoring governance and inclusion risks.

6. Conclusion

This study aimed to elucidate the impact of digital platforms on startup performance by examining the effects of three platform-enabled pillars—global networking, innovation advancement, and funding capacity—and by elucidating the interactions of these mechanisms in practice. Through convergent quantitative and qualitative evidence, we ascertain a distinct and economically significant hierarchy: global networking exhibits the most substantial correlation with revenue, succeeded by innovation, and subsequently funding. Complementarity tests show that networking increases the benefits of innovation, and businesses that use more than one type of platform (funding, networking, and collaboration/accelerator) do better than businesses that only use one type. In short, connectivity is the key that allows platform participation to reach more people, speed up learning, and get resources moving. We have achieved all the research objectives. We use multivariate models and formal coefficient comparisons to measure and rank the relative effects of the three pillars. We also show that global networking is the most important factor, show how the pillars work together through interaction tests and group contrasts, and check the stability of the results with extensive diagnostics and robustness checks (alternative outcomes, influence trimming, index reweighting, and rank-based regressions). We also talk about platform dependency, privacy and security risks, and the digital divide. We turn these real-world problems into useful advice for founders and ecosystem stewards: build globally diverse professional networks early, make rapid tool-enabled innovation cycles a part of your business, use platform finance as a way to signal and reach new customers (not just as a way to get started), and protect yourself from relying on just one platform by using multiple platforms and owned channels.

The study's distinctive contribution is dual. In terms of ideas, it introduces and supports the PRNA framework, which brings together Resource-Based View, Network Theory, and Dynamic Capabilities to explain how platforms can enhance resources, strengthen networks, and speed up changes all at once. The paper advances the literature beyond singular mechanism analyses (e.g., crowdfunding or accelerators in isolation) to an interaction-sensitive elucidation of digital entrepreneurial advantage. It provides firm-level evidence that compares the three pillars and shows how they work together. This study gives entrepreneurs and policymakers a practical answer to where they should focus their limited attention first and how to combine levers for the best results. There are still some issues, though, like the cross-sectional design and the fact that some of the data comes from self-reports. However, the strong agreement between the statistical patterns and the founder stories, along with triangulation from secondary indicators and rigorous robustness analysis, gives us confidence in the findings. The message is clear for practice: put global connectivity first, combine it with disciplined, fast innovation, use platform finance wisely, and design for resilience against problems with governance and inclusion. For research, PRNA offers a framework for longitudinal and sector-specific tests, such as establishing a PRNA index and examining the micro foundations of networking advantage. The study

provides a synthesis of theory, comparative evidence, and practical recommendations, demonstrating that platform-enabled connectivity, in conjunction with innovation and finance, supports resilient and inclusive startup scaling.

References

Autio, E., Nambisan, S., Thomas, L. D. W. and Wright, M., Digital affordances, spatial affordances, and the genesis of entrepreneurial ecosystems, Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 72-95, 2018.

Barney, J., Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage, Journal of Management, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 99-120, 1991.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., Using thematic analysis in psychology, Qualitative Research in Psychology, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77-101, 2006.

Burt, R. S., Structural holes: The social structure of competition, Harvard University Press, 1992.

Cohen, S. and Hochberg, Y. V., Accelerating startups: The seed accelerator phenomenon, SSRN Working Paper, 2014.

Creswell, J. W. and Plano Clark, V. L., Designing and conducting mixed methods research, 3rd Edition, SAGE, 2018.

Cutolo, D. and Kenney, M., Platform-dependent entrepreneurs: Power asymmetries, risks, and strategies in the platform economy, Academy of Management Perspectives, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 584-605, 2021.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D. and Christian, L. M., Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method, 4th Edition, Wiley, 2014.

Faraj, S., Jarvenpaa, S. L. and Majchrzak, A., Knowledge collaboration in online communities, Organization Science, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1224-1239, 2011.

Gawer, A., Platforms, markets and innovation, 2nd Edition, Edward Elgar, 2022.

Granovetter, M. S., The strength of weak ties, American Journal of Sociology, vol. 78, no. 6, pp. 1360-1380, 1973.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. and Anderson, R. E., Multivariate data analysis, 8th Edition, Cengage, 2019.

Hayes, A. F., Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach, 2nd Edition, Guilford Press, 2018.

Hochberg, Y. V., Accelerating entrepreneurs and ecosystems: The seed accelerator model, Innovation Policy and the Economy, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 25-51, 2016.

Isenberg, D. J., The entrepreneurship ecosystem strategy as a new paradigm for economic policy: Principles for cultivating entrepreneurship, Babson Entrepreneurship Ecosystem Project, 2011.

Kenney, M. and Zysman, J., The rise of the platform economy, Issues in Science and Technology, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 61-69, 2016.

Leonardi, P. M., social media, knowledge sharing, and innovation: Toward a theory of communication visibility, Information Systems Research, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 796-816, 2014.

Mollick, E., The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study, Journal of Business Venturing, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 1-16, 2014.

Nambisan, S., Digital entrepreneurship: Toward a digital technology perspective, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1029-1055, 2017.

Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W. and Choudary, S. P., Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy—and how to make them work for you, W. W. Norton, 2016.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. and Podsakoff, N. P., Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it, Annual Review of Psychology, vol. 63, pp. 539-569, 2012.

Roma, P., Messeni Petruzzelli, A. and Perrone, G., From the crowd to the market: The role of reward-based crowdfunding performance in attracting professional investors, Research Policy, vol. 46, no. 9, pp. 1606-1628, 2017.

Sorenson, O., Assenova, V., Li, G.-C., Boada, J. and Samila, S., Expand innovation finance via crowdfunding, Science, vol. 354, no. 6319, pp. 1526-1528, 2016.

Stam, E., Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique, European Planning Studies, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 1759-1769, 2015.

Sussan, F. and Acs, Z. J., The digital entrepreneurial ecosystem, Small Business Economics, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 55-73, 2017.

Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S., Using multivariate statistics, 7th Edition, Pearson, 2019.

Teece, D. J., Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and micro foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance, Strategic Management Journal, vol. 28, no. 13, pp. 1319-1350, 2007.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. and Shuen, A., Dynamic capabilities and strategic management, Strategic Management Journal, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 509-533, 1997.

van Dijk, J., The digital divide, 3rd Edition, Polity, 2020.

Biographies

Dr Rudra Prakash Pradhan is a Professor of Economics in the area of Production and Operations Management at the Vinod Gupta School of Management (VGSoM), Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India. He received his Ph.D. degree in Economics from the Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India. His research interests include applied econometrics, development economics, energy economics, and quantitative modeling for policy and management. He has published extensively in leading international journals and serves as a reviewer for several reputed journals in economics, management, and applied sciences. Prof. Pradhan has supervised doctoral research and led several funded projects in the domains of economic growth, financial development, and technology adoption. He is actively engaged in teaching and research at the intersection of economics, strategy, and management science.

Mohd Tabrej Alam is a Ph.D. Research Scholar in Strategy and Entrepreneurship at the Vinod Gupta School of Management (VGSoM), Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India. He received his B.Tech. degree in Civil Engineering in 2018 and the M.Tech. degree in Strategy and Entrepreneurship from the National Institute of Technology, in 2020. His research interests include technology business incubation, entrepreneurial ecosystems, innovation strategy, and the adoption of Industry 5.0 technologies in small and medium enterprises. He has presented papers at reputed international conferences and published research in national and international refereed journals. He is proficient in analytical and methodological tools such as Python, R, Stata, TISM, MICMAC, AHP, SEM, and Monte Carlo simulations. His ongoing doctoral research focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of technology business incubators in fostering entrepreneurship and innovation in India.