



Interdisciplinary Doctoral School

Doctoral Studies Domain: Management

DOCTORAL THESIS (SUMMARY)

Reputation management for startup
accelerators through social media
campaigns

Candidate:

Andrei Neagoe

Supervisor:

Prof. Univ. Dr. Doina Banciu



© Andrei Neagoe, 2018. The copyright owner for the full content of the present paper is Andrei Neagoe. Any reproduction, publishing or printing, partial or integral, in printed or electronic format of this document, or of any parts of this document is permitted only with the explicit written authorization of the author.

ABSTRACT



Abstract (EN): This paper analyses how reputation and social media create the context for supporting strategies regarding the entrepreneurial ecosystem to emerge. The positive impact of start-up accelerators is depicted by defining them as reputational hubs. Furthermore, a scarcity hypothesis is confirmed by using the case study of a Romanian start-up accelerator: Innovation Labs. A series of novel understandings and instruments are advanced in an attempt to provide start-up accelerators with tools for managing reputation through social media campaigns.

Key words: entrepreneurial ecosystem, entrepreneurial spirit, entrepreneurial strategy, reputation building, social media, brand management, start-up accelerators.

THESIS CONTENTS



ABSTRACT	1
CONTENTS	1
SUMMARY (EN).....	4
SUMMARY (RO).....	14
1. INTRODUCTION.....	24
1.1. Objectives and Core Concepts	26
1.2. Methodology	28
2. THE ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEM AND START-UP ACCELERATORS	31
2.1. The Heroic Discourse of Changing the World.....	32
2.1.1. The Entrepreneurial Spirit	35
2.2. The Feasibility Discourse of Normal Entrepreneurship	40
2.2.1. The Entrepreneurial Strategy.....	42
2.3. European Entrepreneurial Ecosystem.....	49
2.4. Romanian Entrepreneurial Ecosystem.....	51
2.5. The rise of start-up accelerators in the entrepreneurial ecosystem	53
2.5.1. Start-up accelerators between desirability and feasibility.....	55
3. STATE OF THE ART	58
3.1. Theory of Planned Behavior	59
3.1.1. Theory of Planned Behavior and Culture	63
3.1.2. The Entrepreneurial (Sub-) Cultures.....	64
3.2. Theory of Planned Behavior and Entrepreneurship	66
3.2.1. Exogenous factors.....	68
3.2.2. Desirability and Feasibility in Romanian Ecosystem.....	72
3.3. Limits in Theory of Planned Behavior	74

4. CASE STUDY: THE INNOVATION LABS ACCELERATOR	77
4.1. Program Description.....	78
4.2. Innovation Labs and Sustainable Development Goals	81
4.3. Innovation Labs Design and TPB	83
4.4. The Importance of Social Media and Reputation Building for Innovation Labs.....	87
5. THEORETICAL MODEL: REPUTATION THROUGH SOCIAL MEDIA	90
5.1. Social Media Campaigns	91
5.1.1. Social Media and Theory of Planned Behavior on Entrepreneurial Intentions.....	96
5.2. Reputation in the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem.....	98
5.2.1. Reputational Model Dimensions and Indicators	101
6. ANALYSIS OF THE INNOVATION ACCELERATOR	109
6.1. Desirability and Feasibility amongst Innovation Labs participants	110
6.2. TPB Extended Model for Innovation Labs Participants.....	112
6.2.1. Normative Beliefs and Entrepreneurial Subculture	113
6.2.2. Behavioral Beliefs and Entrepreneurial Spirit.....	114
6.2.3. Entrepreneurial Traits: Risk Management	116
6.2.4. Entrepreneurial Traits: Self-identity	117
6.2.5. Strategic Guidelines based on the TBP extended model	122
6.3. Reputation Building for Innovation Labs	125
6.3.1. Information Channels about Innovation Labs	126
6.3.1.1. Innovation Labs 2014 Cluj	126
6.3.1.2. Innovation Labs 2014 Bucharest	127
6.3.1.3. Innovation Labs 2017 Bucharest, Cluj and Timisoara.....	128
6.3.1.4. Innovation Labs 2018 Bucharest, Cluj, Iasi and Timisoara	129
6.3.2. Reputation Forming in the Core Network.....	130
6.3.3. Reputational Capital of Innovation Labs	135
6.3.3.1. Reputational Capital in the Core Network	136

6.3.3.2. Reputational Loops	138
6.3.3.3. Reputational Capital in the Active Network	143
7. BUILDING REPUTATION: A NOVEL INSTRUMENT FOR SOCIAL MEDIA CAMPAIGN DESIGN.....	147
7.1. The Why: Managing Risk with Risk.....	149
7.2. The How: Gambling as Reputation Building.....	151
7.3. The What: Gaming as Token Production	154
7.4. Reputation Management Team	157
8. STRATEGIC GUIDELINES IN MANAGING THE REPUTATIONAL FLOW.....	160
9. CONCLUSIONS.....	163
9.1. Limitations and Further Research	166
10. REFERENCES.....	168
11. ANNEXES.....	177
11.1. ANNEX 1 – Online Content Analyzed	179
11.2. ANNEX 2 – Innovation Labs Questionnaire 2013 (Hackaton).....	183
11.3. ANNEX 3 – Innovation Labs Questionnaire 2014-2018 (Hackaton)	185
11.4. ANNEX 4 – Innovation Labs Questionnaire 2014-2018 (Demoday).....	188
11.5. ANNEX 5 – Example of Static Content Analyzed	191
11.6. ANNEX 6 – Example of Dynamic Content Analyzed	192
11.7. ANNEX 7 – List of Tables	193
11.8. ANNEX 8 – List of Diagrams.....	193
11.9. ANNEX 9 – List of Figures	194
11.10. ANNEX 10 – List of Graphs.....	195

OBJECTIVES



General Objective:

The main objective of this paper is to conceptualize an instrument for reputation management through social media campaigns for start-up accelerators. This is translated as an attempt to not only quantify reputation but also create a framework throughout which it can be managed. While reputational indexes are available on the market, this objective emphasizes the importance of pragmatic frameworks and strategic guidelines regarding reputation management.

Secondary Objectives:

1) Define and analyze the role of start-up accelerators in the entrepreneurial ecosystem

This objective aims at illustrating the historical mechanisms that created the foundations of the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Furthermore, this objective is built around the impact of start-up accelerators over the venture-taking initiatives. As will be presented in the following chapters, this can be done by presenting the main discourses that allows for start-up accelerators to attract and support would-be entrepreneurs, alongside an inquiry into the regional variations regarding these discourses. Moreover, this objective represents a macro extension of the risk perspective presented above.

2) Define and conceptualize a theoretical model for explaining entrepreneurial behavior

This objective aims at illustrating the psychological and sociological mechanism responsible for producing entrepreneurial intentions. Furthermore, this objective is built around the attempt to expand existing models by integrating macro and micro perspective regarding the production on entrepreneurial behaviors. As will be presented in the following chapters, this can be done by understanding exogenous factors as filters that interfere with the production of desirability and feasibility regarding venture-taking initiatives. Moreover, this objective represents a micro extension of the individualistic perspective presented above.

3) *Describe and analyze the Innovation Labs accelerator in relationship to entrepreneurial ecosystem and behaviors*

This objective focuses the observational lens on a specific example of entrepreneurial-supporting strategy: Innovation Labs. Its aim is to place this accelerator between local and global strategies by presenting its characteristics and outputs. Moreover, this objective creates the context for defining and analyzing the relationship between accelerators, reputation and social media.

4) *Create a theoretical model for reputation management throughout social media campaigns in the entrepreneurial ecosystem*

This objective aims at creating the framework for reputation to be quantified by deconstructing already existing models. Its aim is to provide the theoretical foundations for assessing reputation embedded in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. As will be presented in the following chapters, this can be done by following the existing discourses regarding new perspectives over social media and reputation. Moreover, this objective aims at analyzing the relationship between entrepreneurship and reputation.

5) *Analyze current reputation of Innovation Labs using the proposed framework*

This objective aims at applying the proposed framework regarding offline and online processes of Innovation Labs responsible for producing reputation. Moreover, it allows for arguments deduced from documents research to be validated by data gathered from Innovation Labs participants and online community.

6) *Provide a series of strategic guidelines regarding start-up accelerators reputation management*

Finally, the last objective closes the circle by defining the characteristics of the desired output of this paper. Its aim is to create a series of action steps that will provide guidance regarding the management of reputation. As will be presented in the following chapters, creating strategic guidelines represents the most useful tool for reputation management both in the online and offline environment.

Core concepts and Definitions

- a) *Start-up accelerators*: Cooperative supporting initiatives that act as gateways for new entries in the entrepreneurial ecosystem;
- b) *Entrepreneurial ecosystem*: Motivational field, practices, interactions and transactions that use innovation as a resource;
- c) *Entrepreneurial spirit*: Narratives that emerge as the result of a heroic discourse of changing the world and desire for financial security throughout ownership;
- d) *Entrepreneurial strategy*: Means used by new and old players that assures the sustainability of the entrepreneurial ecosystem;
- e) *Reputation*: An entity's characteristic to send intended and unintended signals about sanctions (positive or negative) in reducing social distance relative to its position.



This paper created the theoretical arguments using documents research provided by four fields of activity: management, economy, psychology and sociology. Furthermore, these arguments were supported by data gathered using a survey-based strategy and online community research strategy applied on the case study of Innovation Labs alongside a secondary data analysis regarding new entries in the Romanian entrepreneurial ecosystem. It is important to mention that two major methodological limitations are presents in this paper: first refers to the fact that questions in the research instrument were added and excluded over the six analyzed editions, thus making a comparison sometimes difficult; the second main limitation refers to the online content gathered which was analyzed only in 2018, thus including already applied reputation management strategies.

Regarding the survey-based method, a total number of 1528 of questionnaires were analyzed from 2013-2018 Innovation Labs editions. A total number of 73 questionnaires were analyzed from Bucharest 2013 edition. The 2014 Innovation Labs edition allowed for 189 questionnaires to be analyzed regarding Bucharest and Cluj competitions. Next edition allowed for 172 questionnaires to be assessed (102 at registration and 70 at the end) while the 2016 edition allowed for only 157 questionnaires to be assessed (105 at registration and 52 at the end). Finally, last two editions permitted for a total number of 889 questionnaires to be assessed (442 in 2017 edition and 447 in the 2018 edition).

Regarding the online community research method, a total number of 100 public content was analyzed using Innovation Labs official Facebook page. The content was classified as static (N=58) and dynamic (N=42) and it was labelled by the degree of immersion it provided (photo vs video). Number and type of reactions were used as units of analysis (emoticons, shares, commentaries, views) while the community size was used as a landmark in creating the online reputational model. Appendix 1 contains the database created alongside an example of static and dynamic content. It is worth mentioning that the column regarding the topic and the name of the entity who posted was also included. However, it was made partially censored given data privacy aspects.

A scarcity hypothesis which is introduced in the first chapter of this paper was confirmed by using data from participants' respondents and an index regarding the number of firms in the Romanian ecosystem. Ronald Inglehart (2000) explains the shift of values that happened in the last decades by advancing a scarcity hypothesis which states an increased desirability over things that are less common in the ecosystem. Therefore, this paper explained the decreasing trend of desirability and feasibility regarding 2014-2016 promotions of Innovation Labs by using a similar deficit hypothesis. While the first chapter introduces this hypothesis as a negative relationship between entrepreneurial spirit and strategy using a deductive approach, an inductive approach is used regarding data gathered from the participants.

Presented in the dedicated chapter (*6. Analysis of the Innovation Labs*), the inductive approach used the integrated model of micro and macro elements responsible for producing entrepreneurial intentions to explain variations in desirability and feasibility over entrepreneurship. This approach started by analyzing variations in each element of the model that could explain the decreasing trend regarding 2014-2016 Innovation Labs promotions. First confirmation of the scarcity hypothesis came as the result of comparing the number of self-identified entrepreneurs in Cluj and Bucharest with entrepreneurial activity in each city for the 2014-2016 timespan. Second confirmation of the deficit hypothesis came as the result of comparing the total number of self-identified entrepreneurs from 2016-2018 editions with the entrepreneurial activity in the Romanian ecosystem (*6.2.3 Entrepreneurial Traits: Self-identity*).

Regarding the secondary data analysis for depicting entrepreneurial activity in the Romanian entrepreneurial ecosystem, information was gathered using an online index with the number of firms available at a mentioned web address (*6.2.3 Entrepreneurial Traits: Self-identity*). This required creating an account and applying time and space filters. The number of firms for each year is the result of subtracting previous year's number of firms from analyzed year number of firms. In other words, information regarding new entries for each year in the entrepreneurial ecosystem was obtained by subtracting total number of results of the previous year from the total number of results from current year. For standardizing the results, percentages were created by dividing the number of new entries for a year to the total number of new entries inferred. This was helpful in comparing the entrepreneurial activity in Cluj and Bucharest by encompassing each city characteristics.

SUMMARY



The present paper represents an inquiry into the entrepreneurial ecosystem that uses the case study of a Romanian start-up accelerator: Innovation Labs. Its aim is to analyze how this environment is built and sustained by different entities that support one of the most influential economical function: entrepreneurship. Using data provided by participants` feedback and insights gathered throughout documented research, this paper is trying to create a framework that will help to design and build various supporting strategies regarding entrepreneurial activity. Moreover, data gathered using online community research allows for a robust picture of the processes that support venture-taking initiatives. Starting from Max Weber`s writings about the capitalist spirit and using different perspectives on the entrepreneurial ecosystem, this paper proposes a new approach that aims at expanding start-up accelerators network.

Divided in eight sections, this paper provides a reputation management instrument for the digital environment. Its aim is to provide a different perspective on how social media allowed for a new understanding of reputational flow in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Following an introductory section, a discussion about the origins of the entrepreneurial spirit is proposed from a historical point of view. Afterwards, a psychological perspective is presented using the established theoretical foundations in the scientific field of entrepreneurship. This paper continues by presenting the case study of Innovation Labs and a theoretical model of reputation building throughout social media. Data supporting the arguments is presented in the following chapter alongside a proposal of implementing a system that could differentiate Innovation Labs from its competition.

Regarding the methodological aspect of this paper, it used documents research, survey-based analysis, online community analysis and secondary data analysis to provide data-driven support for arguments presented throughout the construction of the thesis. The results allowed for the confirmation of a scarcity hypothesis that links participation in start-up accelerators to the activity in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. It also created the foundations for the main thesis regarding the importance of strategic reputation management throughout social media campaigns to be supported. Furthermore, by adopting a multidisciplinary approach that uses

economic, psychological and sociological arguments, a robust picture of how reputation affects the micro and macro processes of the entrepreneurial ecosystem was depicted.

A discussion about the current socio economic environment is proposed in the introductory section followed by a series of objectives and methodological instruments used to build the research. The chosen lens that are used to describe current manifestations in the entrepreneurial environment proposes individualism and risk as the two cornerstones that are fueling venture-taking initiatives. The introductory section also presents four core concepts that were used throughout the research for explaining variations in entrepreneurial ecosystem. One of the central concepts refers to reputation as the main resource which attracts would-be entrepreneurs to engage in start-up accelerators processes. As the title suggests, this paper aims at building a reputation management instrument that will allow for a better understanding of what reputation is and how it can be used.

Choosing to place a discussion about risk at the beginning of this paper allows for symmetry to be created considering the proposed system in the last chapter. A managing risk with risk philosophy is advanced which aims at bringing a disruptive growth regarding start-up accelerators reputation. By joining together reputation and risk, a realistic approach that consider both positive and negative aspects can be presented. Moreover, including an individualistic perspective illustrates the starting point of the proposed framework which considers the individual as the fundamental building block of the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Both risk and individualism came up as the cornerstone concepts that allows for a multi-levelled analysis of the relationship between entrepreneurship, start-up accelerators and reputation to be made.

The first chapter of this paper is discussing two of the core concepts: entrepreneurial spirit and entrepreneurial strategy. First refers to narratives that are built at the crossroad of two discourses regarding the desire to change the world and the desire to achieve financial security throughout ownership. The latter is represented by factual actions that illustrates how individuals are managing the entrepreneurial ecosystem entrance barriers. While the entrepreneurial spirit can be considered as the result of a heroic discourse of changing the world, the entrepreneurial strategy is discussed in relationship with the feasibility discourse over the entrepreneurial activity. Taken together, these two concepts provide a landmark in discussing how the European and Romanian environments manage to shape perspectives over entrepreneurship. Afterwards, first chapter continues in analyzing an international and national

barometer that provide in-depth details about cultural aspects regarding entrepreneurial activity.

An important contribution of this section refers to a taxonomy regarding the entrepreneurial strategy. By analyzing venture-taking initiatives in the context of an accelerators, a proposal of two parameters regarding the long-term/short-term orientation and internal/external activity were advanced as adequate indicators of four types of entrepreneurial strategies: design and building strategy alongside attracting and networking strategies. This perspective distance itself from previous attempts that mostly used risk and time as the main characteristics in describing possible options for would-be entrepreneurs. Furthermore, it allowed for a link between individual strategies and supporting strategies to be made regarding the role of start-up accelerators in the entrepreneurial ecosystem.

Drawing on data gathered from 33 countries, including Romania, the above-mentioned barometers managed to offer a clearer picture of the international and national entrepreneurial ecosystem. Going through motifs and barriers regarding engagement in entrepreneurial activity, these studies illustrated a strong influence of cultural factors over venture-taking initiatives. Aspects like the lack of financial means, fear of failure and preference over employee status came up as three of the leading barriers for individuals across countries. A remarkable difference regarding the willingness to express these barriers was found between western and eastern part of Europe, the latter showing an accentuate tendency of stating reasons that stop them from considering taking the entrepreneurial path.

Following the presentation of the international and national entrepreneurial environment, the first chapter discusses the rise of accelerators and their role in turning entrepreneurial spirit into entrepreneurial strategy. Besides their role in converting narratives into actions, accelerators are also presented as shortcuts or gateways to the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Moreover, differences amongst accelerators are described alongside their characteristics and impact on the entrepreneurial environment. Finally, accelerators are placed between the desirability and feasibility discourses over venture-taking initiatives, thus allowing for them to be understood as a macro strategy that enables the formation of meso and micro strategies.

First chapter allowed for the presentation of a macro perspective over the relationship between the entrepreneurial ecosystem and start-up accelerators. It also helped in portraying the main channels of communication between material and cultural factors that create the context for entrepreneurial spirit and strategies to emerge. Moreover, it presented the impact

of start-up accelerators over the entrepreneurial ecosystem and their importance in sustaining a consistent flow of human capital for the national and international environment. By connecting these findings with the micro perspective presented in the following chapters, a clearer picture of how supporting strategies create the framework for sustaining one of the most important functions of the capitalist economy is illustrated.

Next chapter is built around the social and psychological factors that are responsible for producing entrepreneurial intentions. Following a long-lasting tradition that uses the theory of planned behavior as an explicative model for how the entrepreneurial behavior is built, this chapter proceeds in discussing different perspectives and findings that confirm the link between this theory and entrepreneurship. The initial framework is deconstructed, and elements are reassembled so that exogenous factors are included in an expanded model. This paper included three variables that mediate the link between the formation of beliefs and actual production of desirability and feasibility: entrepreneurial spirit, entrepreneurial traits and entrepreneurial subculture. The entrepreneurial spirit is represented as a narrative building process which uses the cognitive and emotional processes responsible for creating positive or negative evaluations over the behavior.

The extended model places past experiences as the central element that determines the formation of desirability and feasibility over entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial traits like self-identity and risk management are considered as mediating factors that allow for concepts in the model to interact. Finally, the entrepreneurial subculture is considered as a collective mind programming that mediates the production of normative beliefs. Regarding the entrepreneurial subculture, this paper proposes the existence of multiple influencing factors ranging from international culture to local institutions. A difference between university, corporate and innovation subcultures is discussed as the result of international and national cultural intersection.

Behavioral and normative beliefs came up as the most important factors regarding the production of entrepreneurial intentions. Control beliefs were pictured as accompanying and filtering the formation of mental schemas regarding desirability and feasibility. This perspective emphasized that attempts to influence the formation process of entrepreneurial intentions must focus on the intersection between normative and behavioral beliefs which in turn gives weight to different control factors that produce the perceived control over the behavior. Empirical findings regarding the validity and fidelity of this theoretical framework were also used in creating the expanded model.

The psychological perspective allowed for an integrated model of macro and micro aspects to be advanced regarding the production of the entrepreneurial intentions. By deconstructing and rebuilding the theoretical model a better understanding of how individuals are drawn into following the entrepreneurial path was obtained. Placing the exogenous factors between the psychological processes and the production of desirability and feasibility instead of considering them as background aspects allows for a cultural filters approach to be advanced. Together with the macro perspective presented in the previous chapter an integrated model that considers material and cultural factors regarding the production of entrepreneurial intentions is provided.

Next chapter is organized around the presentation of Innovation Labs` organization and processes. First part focuses on the benefits obtained by the participants by engaging in this learning environment. This accelerator and other alike initiatives format and allows for the illustration of a supporting network that encourages venture-taking initiatives in the Romanian environment. An important aspect discussed in this part refers to an accelerator function to build trust and attract resources towards new entrepreneurial activity. Other aspects like the roadmap of the participants and the characteristics of the experienced are presented in this section.

The following section of the chapter that presents the case study of Innovation Labs is built around its connections to the international strategies for sustainable development. Drawing on UN sustainable development goals and different products created by the participants, a clearer picture of how this accelerator is contributing to the larger societal wellbeing is depicted. Yet another perspective that states the importance of Innovation Labs in providing the human capital for further strategies is presented in this chapter. Following this, a discussion about the link between Innovation Labs and Theory of Planned Behavior is presented. Using different components like venture talks and workshops on doing business, the next section of the chapter illustrates how Innovation Labs nurtures the production of desirability and feasibility over entrepreneurial behaviors.

Finally, this chapter is ended by presenting the main thesis of this paper which refers to the importance of reputation for the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Portrayed as the main resource that attracts individuals into engaging with Innovation Labs processes, reputation is presented in connection with social media. Distinctions between program`s reputation and participants` reputation are made alongside the introduction of some properties of reputational flow. The concept of reputational loop is introduced to describe reputation`s propriety to aggregate.

Besides the distinction of collective reputation and individual reputation, a discussion about the importance of social media networks and word of mouth channels is also presented in this chapter.

This chapter allowed for the presentation of Innovation Labs characteristics which will prove as an important factor in proposing a reputation building strategy. Considering that reputation represents a term that is related to differentiation amongst competition, this chapter also allowed for the presentation of the main thresholds embedded in Innovation Labs processes that are responsible for producing this resource. Presented as a two-staged process, the experience of this start-up accelerator creates the context for soft and hard skills to be produced and nurtured. This perspective permitted the link between human capital and reputational capital to be depicted as an important aspect to be considered for the construction of the theoretical model presented in the following chapter.

Divided in two sections, next chapter represents an attempt to model reputational flow starting from social media processes. A literature review about the digital environments helps in building a social media instrument for strategic promotion campaigns. Building on the functional blocks of social media and using a series of unconventional perspectives collected throughout the documents research, a series of trending approaches is presented before attempting to build a reputational model. Moreover, a discussion about the impact of social media on entrepreneurial intentions is presented using the theory of planned behavior. An important aspect here is the importance of social media to remove barriers that blocks the formation of entrepreneurial intentions and behaviors.

Next section represents the theoretical framework of this paper and proposes a signal approach for understanding reputation. Different perspectives from the literature review are discussed and summarized to allow the illustration of reputational components. Competence and sympathy came up as two dimensions that create reputation for an entity while trust and reciprocity are depicted as two accompanying concepts that allow for reputation fluctuations. A difference between reputation building and reputation gaining is also presented in this section by referring to the source of the signals. Finally, the main components of reputation are described and applied for the digital environment. Another important distinction here is represented by the layers of the network described relative to an entity position. A difference between passive, active and core network allowed for a quantification of reputational flow in the digital environment.

This chapter created a powerful added-value regarding the intersection between reputation, trust and reciprocity by providing a simplistic mathematical approach which allows the quantification of reputational capital. Defining trust as the condition created by receiving a signal regarding sanctions for reducing social distance, the actual reduction of social distance and receiving of promised sanctions, this paper managed to create a solid foundation for further models to be developed. Another important added-value refers to adapting a reputational quantification model to the approach proposed in this chapter. This allowed for a framework to be created for quantifying reputation in the digital environment.

Finally, by integrating different perspectives over reputation gathered throughout the documents research, this paper proposed four dimensions of reputation: receptiveness, attractiveness, transmission and rejection. Taken together, these dimensions allowed for participants responses and online community reactions to be analyzed using a signal-approach perspective over reputation. No distinction between brand image and reputation has been introduced considering that every action of an entity impacts the reputational capital. However, the reputation gaining and building distinction was used to encompass the unclear border between image and reputation. Furthermore, this analysis created a series of benchmarks for setting goals regarding social media campaigns.

The following chapter presents data from participants` feedback to provide data-driven arguments that supports the theoretical discussion presented so far. First section is presenting the desirability and feasibility discourse over entrepreneurship regarding Innovation Labs 2014-2016 promotions. Results depict a decreasing trend in both discourses amongst the participants allowing for questions regarding the cause to dictate the next sections. The answer is built using the added elements of the extended model of the theory of planned behavior. Moreover, next sections also manage to understand which of the elements weight more in building entrepreneurial intentions by inferring coefficients from participants` responses.

The cause of the declining trend was first searched in the entrepreneurial subculture concept. While data regarding normative beliefs created by relevant-others suggest a rather supportive subculture regarding Innovation Labs participants, results show a consistency of detracting personal networks amongst participants. However, the cause of a decline in desirability and feasibility couldn`t be explained by variations in the supportiveness of the entrepreneurial subculture. Therefore, the next section proposed entrepreneurial spirit as a possible explanation. While data available only for the 2017-2018 promotions didn't allow for a comparison between variations in self-determination and the decreasing trend of desirability

and feasibility, it managed to illustrate the importance of the concept in producing entrepreneurial intentions.

Next two sections were built around variations in two of the most important entrepreneurial traits amongst Innovation Labs participants: risk-management and self-identity concept. Data available for 2015-2016 promotions presented a more realistic approach to risk in the 2016th edition, thus not being able to explain the decreasing trend of desirability and feasibility over entrepreneurial behaviors. Finally, a possible explanation was found in the self-identity concept by comparing the number of participants who identified themselves as entrepreneurs in Cluj and Bucharest. The results are using a population ecology model presented in the literature review to explain a larger number of self-identified entrepreneurs in Cluj compared with Bucharest, thus illustrating the importance of the entrepreneurial activity in the ecosystem for explaining variations of desirability and feasibility.

Using data from participants' feedback, a link between self-identity concept and entrepreneurial activity is illustrated, thus allowing for a series of guidelines regarding start-up accelerators social media campaign design to be made. This chapter managed to offer a series of landmarks that uses three main phases of the entrepreneurial ecosystem: the growing phase, the saturation point and the declining phase. By adopting a cycle-based perspective and elements of the theory of planned behaviors, guidelines about the appropriate timeframe to use different strategies are presented. Results propose using the formation of normative beliefs in the growing phase, offering incentives in the saturation phase and creating meaning in the declining phase.

This finding allowed for a scarcity hypothesis that correlates the manifestations of entrepreneurial spirit to the activity in the entrepreneurial ecosystem to be confirmed. Briefly, the hypothesis states that desirability of entrepreneurship, translated as a self-identification phenomenon, is created as the result of a declining birth-rate in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Using data regarding new entries in the business sector, differences in entrepreneurial self-identified participants between Cluj and Bucharest were explained as the consequence of a declining entrepreneurial activity in the former city. By looking at national data regarding the entrepreneurial activity, the decreasing trend in desirability and feasibility was also explained by the scarcity hypothesis proposed by Ronald Inglehart to describe the paradigmatic shift resulted from the transition to post-modernity.

Next section is assessing the current reputational capital of the Innovation Labs initiative and starts with presenting the main channels of information that allows for reputation building and gaining signals. Results indicate that word of mouth channels and social media networks represent two of the most important sources of reputation for start-up accelerators. Using the proposed model, reputation in the core and active network is quantified, illustrating a series of noises that interfere with reputation building signals. Data gathered from participants' feedback depicted a moderate loss of signal-power in the relationship between mentors and participants. An interesting finding regarding reputation formation in the core network refers to the validity of the 80-20 rule in quantifying how reputation is built and sent towards the external environment.

The following section is assessing reputation in the active network by analyzing static and dynamic content gathered throughout online community research. Results allow for a comparison between the reputational impact of each type of signal and the creation of risk categories obtained by a qualitative analysis of rejecting entities. The findings of this analysis depict dynamic content as being better received and transmitted while static content allow for more sympathy reactions. Regarding reputational risk categories, competence of partners and negative attitudes towards political affiliations came up as the most important negative producing factors. This chapter concluded that word of mouth channel represents the most powerful reputation source regarding Innovation Labs initiative.

Next chapter is advancing a proposal which aims at expanding the Innovation Labs network and assure engagement throughout passive and active network. Using a metaphorical understanding of the digital environment, this proposal uses gaming and gambling as two reputational producing factors that could be used to engage more entities in the start-up accelerator network. Briefly, the system presented is proposing a token-based reward system that builds on the gap between participants' performance and their chance of winning the competition. Accompanied by an implementation plan, this proposal can be further developed to encompass alike initiatives, thus allowing for an expanded innovation network to grow. Another added-value presented in this chapter refers to using network shocking strategies (synchronous signaling) and hybrid content (GIFs) to promote start-up accelerators' initiative. Finally, the last section provides a reputation management tool for social media campaign design which describes the four job descriptions that can fulfil this function. Using the competence/sympathy difference and reputation building/gaining distinction, each role is presented alongside its main attributions and functions. While the proposed team composition

is built around the token-based reward system, it can also be applied in different reputation management scenarios.

Last chapter provides an illustration of the reputational flow created by start-up accelerators alongside a series of strategic guidelines regarding reputation management throughout social media campaigns. The game-theory approach of reputation is discussed which in turn allowed for different understandings of reputation to be presented. Integrating the findings presented throughout the paper, this chapter also manages to identify the importance of using social networks software for identifying influencers in the digital environment alongside a need for a social responsibility dimension to be included in reputation building signals. Moreover, the guidelines also emphasized on building a reputation management plan that considers the relationship between mentors and teams alongside aspects related to content management and creation.

In the last section of this chapter a figure illustrating the main reputation producing relationships is presented and weight is given for every channel that act as mediums for information transmission. Its main function is to provide the framework for crisis management plan regarding reputational issues. Furthermore, this section emphasized the role of relationship management for nurturing the reputational capital and depicted the main reputational thresholds regarding start-up accelerators network. Together, these instruments will allow for further strategic campaigns to be developed using benchmarks created throughout this paper.

The present paper integrated a series of different perspectives over the entrepreneurial ecosystem and the importance of reputation management throughout social media campaign designs. Using an interdisciplinary approach, the main contribution of this paper referred to confirming the population ecology model by using the scarcity hypothesis regarding self-identity dimension of entrepreneurial behavior. Furthermore, it managed to provide a series of frameworks regarding reputation management for start-up accelerators. Finally, it provided a proposal which aims at creating a common language for alike initiatives by creating constant engagement from the active and passive network.

REFERENCES

1. Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
2. Ajzen, I. (2011). The Theory of Planned Behaviour: Reactions and Reflections. *Psychology & Health*, 26(9), 1113–27. doi:10.1080/08870446.2011.613995
3. Ajzen, Icek. (2014). The Theory of Planned Behaviour is Alive and Well, and not Ready to Retire: A Commentary on Sniehotta, Pesseau, and Araújo-Soares. *Health Psychology Review*. doi:10.1080/17437199.2014.88347.
4. Azoulay, P., Jones, B., Kim, D., Javier, M. (2018) Age and High-Growth Entrepreneurship, MIT (Online) Available at: <https://bit.ly/2I0Dnuo>, Retrived at 14.07.2018
5. BANCIU, D., (2011) *e-Services in Future Internet - Study-case on Romania*. 6th Ministerial Conference "Borderless eGovernment Services for Europeans", Session 15: Impact of Future Internet on eGovernment Services, 17 - 18 November 2011, Poznan International Fair, Poland
6. BANCIU, D., (2011) *Managementul protecției informației din perspectiva Agendei Digitale pentru Europa – i2020*. Conferința internațională "Noile provocări globale de securitate cibernetică. Rolul structurilor de tip CERT", Palatul Parlamentului, București, 29 septembrie 2011
7. Barabási, A. L. (2003). Linked: The new science of networks, *Journal of Physics*, V.71, Issue 3, 409-410, <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1538577>
8. Baron, J., & Hershey, J. C. (1988). Outcome bias in decision evaluation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 54(4), 569, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.569>
9. Calida, B., Gheorghe, A. V., and Unal, R. (2010). Dealing with next generation infrastructures academic programs complexity induced resiliency assessment. " *International Journal for Experimental Design and Process Optimization*, 6 (4), (pp. 347-362)
10. Ciocarlan, D., Moroe, R., & Dragomir, A. (2013). Influența rețelei sociale Facebook asupra notorietății mărcilor în mediul online. *Revista de Marketing Online* , 5 (3)

11. Cohen, Susan (2013) What Do Accelerators Do? Insights from Incubators and Angels, MIT Press Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalisation, 8(3-4), pp19-45
12. Dempwolf, C.S. & Auer, J & D'Ippolito, M. (2015). Innovation accelerators: Defining characteristics among startup assistance organizations. 93-142. Milton J. Rosenberg and Carl I. Hovland (1960)
13. Dimitratos, P. & Plakoyiannaki (2003) Theoretical Foundation of an International Entrepreneurial Culture, E. Journal of International Entrepreneurship 1: 187. doi.org/10.1023/A:1023804318244
14. Duygu T, Senem, S., (2009) "Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students?", Journal of European Industrial Training, Vol. 33 Issue: 2, pp.142-159, doi.org/10.1108/03090590910939049
15. Econsultancy. (2010). Social Media & Online PR Business Case. Retrieved from E-Consultancy: <https://econsultancy.com/reports/social-media-online-pr-business-case>
16. Engle, R. & Dimitriadi, N. & Gavidia, J. & Schlaegel, C. & Delanoë-Gueguen, S. & Alvarado, I. & He, X. & Baume, S & Wolff, B. (2010). Entrepreneurial intent: A twelve country evaluation of Ajzen's model on planned behaviour. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research. 16. 35-57. 10.1108/13552551011020063.
17. Ettenson, R., Knowels, J. (2008) Don't Confuse Reputation With Brand, MIT Sloan Management Review, Vol 49, No 2, (Online) Available at: <https://bit.ly/2AxEtdt> , Retrived at 02.08.2018
18. Falko F. Sniehotta, Justin Presseau & Vera Araújo-Soares (2014) Time to retire the theory of planned behaviour, Health Psychology Review, 8:1, 1-7, DOI: [10.1080/17437199.2013.869710](https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2013.869710)
19. Fernando, G., Fe de Pinho, L. (2009) The importance of entrepreneurship competitions to spread entrepreneurship spirit and to support startup creation, Congresson da APDR, (Online) Portugal, Available at: <https://bit.ly/2NM7Ewf> , Retrived on 12.07.2018
20. Fitzsimmons, J., Douglas, E. (2010) Interaction between feasibility and desirability in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions, Journal of Business Venturing 26 (2011) 431-440, doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.01.001
21. Fishbein, M., Ajzen, I (1975) Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behaviour. An Introduction to Theory and Research (Online) Available at <https://bit.ly/2LkgOhx> , Retrived at 14.07.2018

22. Flash Eurobarometer (2010) Entrepreneurship in Europe. A survey in the Eu, EFTA countries, Croatia, Tukey, the US, Japan, South Coria and China, Flash EB series 283, *The Gallup Organisation*.
23. Forster, Florian & Grichnik, Dietmar: Intention Formation in Social Entrepreneurship: An Empirical Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior. 2011. - 15. Interdisziplinäre Jahreskonferenz zur Gründungsforschung (G-Forum) 2011. - St. Gallen/Zürich.
24. Ganco, M., Holcomb, T., McDonald, R. (2016) Entrepreneurial Strategy, Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, (Online), Available at <https://bit.ly/2uxQU30> , Retrieved on 13.07.2018
25. Gheorghe, A. V. (2006). Risks in business design for critical infrastructures: the 'DASHBOARD' concept. *International Journal Critical Infrastructures*, 2 (1)
26. Gheorghe, A. V., Vamanu, D. V., Katina, P. F., and Pulfer, R. (2018). *Critical Infrastructures, Key Resources, Key Assets: Risk, Vulnerability, Resilience, Fragility, and Perception Governance*. New York, NY: Springer
27. Giddens, A. (2014) *Turbulent and Mighty Continent: What Future for Europe?* Cambridge: Polity, p14, ISBN 0745680968
28. Go, E., Han You, K. (2016) But not all social media are the same: Analysing organisations' social media usage patterns, *Telematics and Informatics*, Volume 33, Issue 1, February 2016, 176-186, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.06.016>
29. Hochberg, Y. V. (2016). Accelerating entrepreneurs and ecosystems: The seed accelerator model. *Innovation Policy and the Economy*, 16(1), 25-51.
30. Hoon, S., Hong, d. (2001) Entrepreneurial Spirit among East Asian Chinese, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 42(3) 285–309 doi.org/10.1002/1520-6874(200005/06)42:3%3C285::AID-TIE2%3E3.0.CO;2-5
31. Inglehart, R. (2000) Globalisation and Postmodern Values, *The Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, The Washington Quarterly* • 23:1 pp. 215–228.
32. Isabelle, D. A. (2013). Key factors affecting a technology entrepreneur's choice of incubator or accelerator. *Technology innovation management review*, 3(2).
33. Isenberg, D. (2011) *The Entrepreneurship Ecosystem Strategy as a New Paradigm for Economic Policy: Principles for Cultivating Entrepreneurship*, The Babson Entrepreneurship Project
34. [Jason Lortie, Gary Castogiovanni, 2015: The theory of planned behavior in entrepreneurship research: what we know and future directions;](#)

<https://www.springerprofessional.de/the-theory-of-planned-behavior-in-entrepreneurship-research-what/10828194>

35. James C. Hayton & Gabriella Cacciotti (2013) Is there an entrepreneurial culture? A review of empirical research, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25:9-10, 708-731, DOI: [10.1080/08985626.2013.862962](https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2013.862962)
36. Jayram D, Manrai, A, Manrai, L. (2015) Effective use of technology in Eastern Europe: Web analytics, social media, customer analytics, digital campaigns and mobile applications, *Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, Volume 20, Issue 39, 118-132, doi.org/10.1016/j.jefas.2015.07.001
37. Johnson, S., Van de Ven, A., (2017) A Framework for Entrepreneurial Strategy, *Strategic Entrepreneurship, Creating a New Mindset*, Chapter 4, doi.org/10.1002/9781405164085.ch4
38. Kaplan, M., Haenlein (2010) Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media, *Business Horizon*, 53, 59-68, doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.00
39. Kapow. (2014). Five Key Lessons for Converting Social Media Data into Business Intelligence . Retrieved from Kapow Software: <http://kapowsoftware.com/assets/whitepapers/Five%20Key%20Lessons%20Converting%20Social%20Media%20Data.pdf>
40. Kaufman, R (2013) *Cultura serviciilor superioare*, Publica, București, ISBN 978-606-8360-49-2
41. Kautonen, Teemu & van Gelderen, Marco & Fink, Matthias. 2015. Robustness of the Theory of Planned Behavior in Predicting Entrepreneurial Intentions and Actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Volume 39, Issue 3. 655-674. ISSN 1042-2587 (printed). DOI: 10.1111/etap.12056
42. Kietzmann, J., Hermkens, K., McCharty, I, Slvestre, B., (2011) Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media, *Business Horizons* Volume 54, Issue 3, 241-25, doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.005
43. Krueger Jr, N. (2000). The Cognitive Infrastructure of Opportunity Emergence. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3), 5–23.
44. Mui, L & Mohtashemi, Mojdeh & Halberstadt, A. (2002). A computational model of trust and reputation. 2431 - 2439. doi:10.1109/HICSS.2002.994181.
45. Murray, J. (1984) A Concept of entrepreneurial strategy, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 5, I-13, doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050102

46. National Entrepreneurship Barometer (2015) Antreprenorii Vorbesc, Barometrul Antreprenoriatului Romanesc, EY Romania, editia a3a.
47. Neagoe, A. Social Media and the Information Management System – Case of e-SENS, The 1st International Management Conference in Danube Delta – “Challenges, Performances and Tendencies in the Organization Management”, June 22-24, 2014, Murighiol, Romania
48. Norman, Donald (1988) The Design of Everyday Things, Basic Books, New York (Online) Available at: <https://bit.ly/2ioKQHt> , Retrived at: 29.07.2018
49. Jr Norris F. Krueger & Alan L Carsrud (1993) Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour, Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 5:4, 315-330, DOI: 10.1080/08985629300000020
50. Olshausen, B. A. (2004). Bayesian probability theory. The Redwood Center for Theoretical Neuroscience, Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute at the University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.
51. Payal, A. (2012) Typology of Web 2.0 spheres: understanding the cultural dimensions of social media spaces, Current Sociology 60:5999, DOI: 10.1177/001139211244043
52. Pekka Aula, (2010), "Social media, reputation risk and ambient publicity management", Strategy&Leadership, Vol.38Issue:6pp.43 – 49 dx.doi.org/10.1108/10878571011088069
53. Pineiro-Chousa, J., Vizcaino-Gonzalez, M., Lopez-Cabarcos, A. (2016) Reputation, Game-Theory and Entrepreneurial Sustainability, Sustainability Journal 2016, 8, 1196; doi:10.3390/su8111196
54. Rada, A. (2013). How marketing was altered by social media. The fifth “P”. Retrieved 05 15, 2014, from alexrada.com: <http://alexrada.com/post/24329527799/how-marketing-was-altered-by-social-media-the-fifth#.U4RpzF4imHc>
55. Rosenberg, M., Hovland, C. (1960) Cognitive, affective and behavioural components of attitudes, Attitude Organisation and Change (pp 3-30), New Heaven, Yale University Press.
56. Ruef, M, Lounsbury, M. (2007) The Sociology of Entrepreneurship, Research in the social organisations, DOI: 10.1016/S0733-558X(06)25001-8
57. Sabater, J., & Sierra, C. (2001). Social regret, a reputation model based on social relations. ACM SIGecom Exchanges, 3(1), 44-56, doi>10.1145/844331.844337
58. Schumpeter, J. (1947) “The Creative Response in Economic History.” The Journal of Economic History, 7: 149-159.
59. Schwaiger, M. Schmalenbach Bus Rev (2004) Components and Parameters of Corporate Reputation-An Empirical Study 56: 46. doi.org/10.1007/BF03396685

60. Sonfield, M., Lussier, R. (1997) The entrepreneurial strategy matrix: A model for new and ongoing ventures, *Business Horizons*, Volume 40, issue 3, pp 73-77
[doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813\(97\)90055-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813(97)90055-0)
61. TNS Opinion & Social. (2012). *Entrepreneurship in the EU and Beyond. Flash Eurobarometer354*. Retrieve from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_354_en.pdf
62. Christina Whidya Utami, 2017: Attitude, Subjective Norms, Perceived Behavior, Entrepreneurship Education and Self-efficacy toward Entrepreneurial Intention University Student in Indonesia; *European Research Studies Journal* Volume XX, Issue 2A, 2017; https://www.ersj.eu/repec/ers/papers/17_2_A_p29.pdf
63. Weber, M., Baher, P., Wells C. (2002) *The Protestant ethic and the "spirit" of capitalism*, Penguin, ISBN 978-0-14-043921-2.
64. Zhuang Ziyin (2005) *Entrepreneurial Spirit, Continuous Technological Innovation and the Micro-mechanism of Long-run Economic Growth* , *World Economy* 12, 005, 2005, (Online) Available at: <https://bit.ly/2KZZwcX>, Retrieved on 12.07.2018

Analyzed Web Links (selection):

65. Expert Says Social Entrepreneurs Have Social Media Secret Weapon
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/devinthorpe/2018/04/05/expert-says-social-entrepreneurs-have-social-media-secret-weapon/#6a1b09191051>
66. 10 Proven Ways to Make Millions on Social Media
<https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/300631>
67. 15 Inspiring Entrepreneurs Who Built Careers Around Their Passions Through Social Media <https://blog.bufferapp.com/earn-income-social-media>
68. Is social media a good thing for young entrepreneurs ?
<https://www.virgin.com/entrepreneur/social-media-good-thing-young-entrepreneurs>
69. 27 Social Media Campaign Ideas From Big Brands You Want to Be
<https://www.impactbnd.com/blog/social-media-campaign-ideas>
70. Top 10 Influential Social Media Marketing Campaigns of 2017
<https://www.adherecreative.com/blog/top-10-influential-social-media-marketing-campaigns-of-2017>

71. 7 of the Best Social Media Campaigns (And What You Can Learn From Them)
<https://blog.hootsuite.com/social-media-campaign-strategy/>
72. How to create a killer social media campaign
<https://www.creativebloq.com/features/how-to-create-a-killer-social-media-campaign>
73. How to Design a Social Media Campaign
<https://www.socialmediaexaminer.com/social-media-campaign-elements/>
74. 10 Outstanding Social Media Campaigns You Need to See
<https://www.searchenginejournal.com/social-media-marketing-campaign-examples/192583/>
75. How to Create Branded Social Media Graphics That Will Make Followers Stop and Engage
<http://blog.visme.co/social-media-campaign-ideas/>
76. 6 great social media campaigns to inspire your 2018 marketing strategy
<https://www.talkwalker.com/blog/great-social-media-campaigns-2018-marketing-strategy>
77. 4 Tips To Design A Successful Social Media Campaign
<https://elearningindustry.com/design-a-successful-social-media-campaign-4-tips>
78. Cause Marketing: How These 20 Visual Campaigns Created Massive Impact
<https://www.canva.com/learn/cause-marketing/>
79. 14 Essential Tips for an Engaging Facebook Business Page
<https://blog.hubspot.com/marketing/how-to-create-facebook-business-page-ht>
80. 8 Ways to Create the Perfect Facebook Post
<https://www.advertisemint.com/8-ways-create-perfect-facebook-post/>
81. 11 Simple Ways to Increase Facebook Engagement
<https://blog.hootsuite.com/increase-facebook-engagement/>
82. 20 Secrets That'll Boost Your Facebook Organic Reach
<https://neilpatel.com/blog/13-secrets-thatll-boost-your-facebook-organic-reach/>
83. Predicting the Entrepreneurial Intentions of University Students: Applying the Theory of Planned Behaviour in Zambia, Africa
<https://www.scirp.org/journal/PaperInformation.aspx?PaperID=78572>
84. Prior Exposure and Educational Environment towards Entrepreneurial Intention
https://scielo.conicyt.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0718-27242017000200006
85. America's Top 7 Startup Accelerators and What Makes Each Unique
<https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/300026>

86. What is a startup accelerator or incubator?
<https://fundersclub.com/learn/startup-accelerators-and-incubators/startup-accelerators-and-incubators-overview/what-is-a-startup-accelerator-or-incubator/>
87. Romanian accelerators / incubators
<http://www.romanianstartups.com/accelerators-incubators/>
88. Understanding the Differences between Accelerators, Incubators, and Innovation Labs
<https://hartfordinsurtechhub.com/understanding-differences-accelerators-incubators-innovation-labs/>
89. What Do Accelerators Do? Insights from Incubators and Angels
https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/INOV_a_00184
90. What Startup Accelerators Really Do
<https://hbr.org/2016/03/what-startup-accelerators-really-do>
91. The basics of startup accelerators—what you need to know
<https://blog.markgrowth.com/the-basics-of-startup-accelerators-what-you-need-to-know-f2eda8f325ca>
92. 10 Startup Accelerators Based On Successful Exits
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/alejandrocremades/2018/08/07/top-10-startup-accelerators-based-on-successful-exits/#3239cdf64b3b>
93. Startup Accelerator Programmes: A practice guide
<https://www.nesta.org.uk/toolkit/startup-accelerator-programmes-a-practice-guide/>
94. Romanian Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Index
<http://ree.uefiscdi.ro/entrepreneurship-in-romania/romanian-entrepreneurial-ecosystem-index/>; <http://ree.uefiscdi.ro/>
95. Romanian Startup Ecosystem Analysis – MyGateway
<https://spherikaccelerator.com/program/romanian-startup-ecosystem-analysis-mygateway/>
96. Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Attitudes
<https://www.gemconsortium.org/country-profile/103>
97. Analysis. Romanian entrepreneurship: Growth seeds must be sown early
<http://business-review.eu/news/analysis-romanian-entrepreneurship-growth-seeds-must-be-sown-early-160853>
98. EY Barometer - Entrepreneurs Speak Out: 88% of Romanian entrepreneurs consider it difficult to access funding
https://www.ey.com/ro/en/home/press-release_eso-barometer-2013_13-february-2014

99. Entrepreneurship Program
<https://ro.usembassy.gov/embassy/bucharest/sections-offices/economic-section/entrepreneurship-program/>
100. The Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan
https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/promoting-entrepreneurship/action-plan_en
101. Entrepreneurship in Europe
<https://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/entrepreneurship-in-europe>
102. EU wants 'entrepreneurship' in education systems
<https://euobserver.com/education/140591>
103. Supporting women's entrepreneurship in Europe
<http://www.euronews.com/2018/06/29/supporting-women-s-entrepreneurship-in-europe>
104. Entrepreneurs for Social Change
<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=23553>
105. Promoting entrepreneurship for sustainable development <https://www.seed.uno/>
106. Sustainable development and entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future directions <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0883902610000200>
107. Innovation and sustainable development through entrepreneurship
<https://www.kessels-smit.com/en/innovation-and-sustainable-development-through-entrepreneurship>
108. Entrepreneurship and sustainable development
<https://www.slideshare.net/hfrederick/entrepreneurship-and-sustainable-development-72838734>
109. How The UN Plans To Use Innovation And Entrepreneurship For Sustainable Development <https://www.forbes.com/sites/nishacharya/2015/03/07/how-the-un-plans-to-use-innovation-and-entrepreneurship-for-sustainable-development/#23911e0cd7b7>
110. Innovation Labs <https://innovationlabs.ro/>; <https://www.facebook.com/ILabsRo/>
111. Innovation Labs 2018: câștigătorii care au impresionat la Demo Day
<https://start-up.ro/innovation-labs-2018-castigatorii-care-au-impresionat-la-demo-day/>
112. Însărcinatul cu afaceri a.i. al SUA, Abigail Rupp, la Innovation Labs Demo Day
<https://ro.usembassy.gov/ro/abigail-rupp-la-innovation-labs-demo-day/>
113. Alocuțiunea Președintelui României, domnul Klaus Iohannis, susținută în cadrul evenimentului Innovation Labs – Demo Day
<http://www.presidency.ro/ro/presedinte/agenda-presedintelui/participare-la-evenimentul-demo-day-programul-innovation-labs>

114. Innovation Labs: 62 de idei de afaceri selectate în prima etapă la nivel national
<https://www.zf.ro/business-hi-tech/innovation-labs-62-de-idei-de-afaceri-selectate-in-prima-etapa-la-nivel-national-17060086>
115. Innovation Labs 2018: 24 de start-up-uri de tehnologie, selectate în prima etapă din București <https://www.zf.ro/business-hi-tech/innovation-labs-2018-24-de-start-up-uri-de-tehnologie-selectate-in-prima-etapa-din-bucuresti-17050465/poze/>
116. Brand Management – 5 Simple and Effective Principles
<https://www.canto.com/blog/brand-management/>
117. Brand Management, <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/brand-management.asp>
118. Learn About Brand Management, <https://www.thebalancesmb.com/what-is-brand-management-2296930>
119. 12 Major Principles of Brand Management for successful Business
<https://www.educba.com/12-basic-principles-of-brand-management/>
120. 10 Pro Online Reputation Management Tips For Local Businesses
<https://searchengineland.com/10-pro-online-reputation-management-tips-for-local-businesses-182230>
121. Social Media Reputation Management Techniques
<https://www.businessblogshub.com/2016/01/social-media-reputation-management-techniques/>
122. Business reputation management lessons from Fortune 500 companies
<https://www.reputationdefender.com/blog/smb/business-reputation-management-lessons-fortune-500-companies>
123. Techniques for reputation management <https://www.reputationx.com/orm/techniques>