**Conclusions for Kickstarter Campaign Dataset**

From the dataset for Kickstarter campaigns, we can conclude that the majority of campaigns are successful. However, it is not by a very large margin compared to failed and canceled campaigns as it’s around 54% successful. It is probably more accurate to state that slightly more than half of Kickstarter campaigns are successful, and by that same measurement, almost half of Kickstarter campaigns are unsuccessful. This would be helpful for people who are new to funding projects and Kickstarter. They might need to really go over other statistics and information to decide if this is the right path for themselves.

In looking further at the date, the most popular types of Kickstarter campaigns are for theater as the majority of the campaigns fall into that category. However, music campaigns are more likely to be funded. An odd thing to note is that every single journalism campaign has been canceled. The other parent categories have much more variability. Breaking down campaigns into subcategories, you see that certain subcategories are always funded, and some are never funded. Animation campaigns have only failed campaigns while documentaries have only successful campaigns. If you look into the subcategories for music, you see that the jazz, faith, and world music have never had a successful campaign. With the exception of indie rock, all of the other music categories have had every campaign listed as successful. If you were to keep looking throughout the parent and subcategories, patterns can be derived for what is the most popular type of campaign and help indicate what kind of campaign is more likely to succeed. Music has the highest success rate, but as stated previously, you see it’s only for certain categories. Going back to theater, there are only three types of subcategories, and the results are more varied that the music subcategories. However, theater has the most campaigns and the highest number of successful campaigns. We can conclude that theater projects are more likely to use Kickstarter to attempt funding and will have a decent chance of success. Music campaigns have a greater chance of being successful if they fall into certain categories. Bringing back to the first point of Kickstarter only being at a 54% success rate, if someone were looking to fund a music campaign, Kickstarter might be a viable avenue for them as long as it’s in one of the more popular subcategories that get funded.

When we go over the data by date and look at patterns for the months, December has the lowest number of total campaigns, and May, June and July have the highest number of campaigns. May has the highest number of successful campaigns, and December has the lowest number of successful campaigns. May would likely be an optimal time to start a campaign, and December will likely be the worst. Canceled Campaigns stay fairly steady though the year with a slight spike in July and November. Overall, there are more successful campaigns in any month than failed campaigns (and canceled campaigns) with one exception. December is the only month where there are more failed campaigns than successful. December is the worst time to start a Kickstarter campaign, and May would be the most optimal.

The biggest limitation of the data is it is that success is only measured on whether the campaign was fully funded or not. That makes sense as that is Kickstarter’s goal. However, for everyone using the platform that is not the complete story in order for the backer or creator to call a campaign a success. In order to understand that, you have to be aware of Kickstarter works as a whole. It is a means to fund a potential project. Currently on their website when you go to make a pledge, there is text on the screen that “Kickstarter isn’t a store. We don’t guarantee projects or investigate a creator’s ability to complete them.” For people (backers) who pledge a contribution, this is not the end of road. They are expecting some sort of product at some nebulous point after the creator gets their project funded. To them, it is not actual successful campaign until the project itself is complete not just the campaign for funding. There are several notorious examples of people failing to deliver what was promised. Kickstarter does not take the responsibility for that either. This can lead to a lot of distrust around this type of thing and the brand of Kickstarter itself. It will definitely make people hesitant to back projects from creators they are unfamiliar with or at all. It would be extremely beneficial if we had some actual stats on how many of the successful campaigns were actually completed and products provided. Even further on that would be how many were completed on time as the project creator has to guestimate when the product will be completed and delivered. Delayed products could also devalue the trust people put into using Kickstarter. There could actually be some sort of correlation on whether big name projects failing (or even being delayed) lead to contributions on a whole go down. It would be some data of interest.

Another thing limited by this data set is that we don’t really know anything about who started the project. This would be kind of a hard data point to set. However, if an unknown person starts a campaign, the campaign will succeed or fail on how hard their content is promoted either by them or Kickstarter. Big name creators are much more easily funded. If you have any sort of online presence or fanbase, you can get your project funded if it’s not something completely outrageous. A lot of times, the campaigns with creators who have a big fan base will get funded in the first week. They already have a built-in audience and need to fight less for people’s attention to their campaign. For people without a base like that, they’re a lot more reliant on Kickstarter promoting it on the Kickstarter website or their own smaller social media. So there are a couple interesting data points that would be interesting to have: how big of a following the creator has, how fast were they funded before the end of the campaign, and how much traffic does the Kickstarter website actually get outside of specific campaign pages. On that last one if the website itself does not get a lot of traffic from people browsing campaigns, it is going to be a lot harder for a creator to get traffic to their campaign page solely from the Kickstarter website itself even if they’re promoted by Kickstarter. If no one is browsing, it will be hard to get clicks to the campaign page.

Other things we could pull from the data would be to compare countries for the campaigns. Are certain countries more successful or less successful with campaigns. How do the project categories vary country to country? Are there more backers per certain countries? Are there more backers per certain categories of campaigns? There’s a lot of data to sift through with this data set, and a lot of comparisons that could be made. Considering the way the campaign trends over the year with more failed campaigns at the end of the year, it would be interesting to look at how the number of backers very throughout the year. Are there less people funding projects at the end of the year as well? Considering there are less campaigns at the end of the year, one could also break down the types of campaigns and how much money they’re requesting as a goal. The biggest data point might actually be whether the project was featured by Kickstarter and in conjunction of that what percentage was the campaign funded. That would be useful to see what kind of influence the spotlight has on projects. It would probably be also useful to know if they were on the Kickstarter spotlight before or after being funded.

Regarding the bonus analytical data, the information gives some interesting information, but it is not overly surprising. Offhand looking at the failed campaigns, the mean and median are fairly low, so it obviously follows that of course the campaign failed there wasn’t enough people. However, the maximum number of backers for at least one campaign was 1293 people. That is a pretty big outlier when compared to the median and mean. However, there are quite a few campaigns with a good number of people that failed, but about 83% of the failed campaigns have 20 or less backers which makes the mean and median low. The other 17% is most likely the outliers. For unsuccessful/failed campaigns, the mean and median to summarize the data fairly succinctly, but it’s more of a point of confirmation that an unsuccessful campaign does not have many backers. However, considering the extremely high outliers, that would potentially be something worth exploring as that data could be informative regarding other trends or data pulled. The mean and median for successful campaigns follow similar logic. More backers mean the campaign is likely to succeed. There are a few campaigns that succeeded with one backer as the amounts were very low. As a comparison for successful campaigns, those with 20 or less backers only made up about 14.5% which is quite the opposite of the unsuccessful campaigns. It does follow through that more backers are needed to have a successful campaign. This is a decent metric to get a better idea of how likely a campaign is to succeed or not. It isn’t the greatest, but it is an easy data point to use.

There is much more variability between the successful campaigns than the unsuccessful campaigns. I do think this makes sense. Part of that definitely ties in with the idea that more backers means it will be successful. Without a lot of backers, you only have so many numbers, but you can go infinitely higher from that point. You can always add more backers, but you can’t keep taking them away when you have none. Another variable to look at for this would be the percent funded. How many of the campaigns with backer counts on the extreme end are over funded? How many of these campaigns have a low initial goal? There’s a lot of variability because there are so many variables that could change how many people actually backed the campaign. In addition to that, there’s going to be a level of trust and sense of confidence that a person would have to have in the creator since Kickstarter is not liable if the product is not delivered. But that is kind of a hard thing to pin down as a data point. A few data points that might help highlight things would be when the backers joined and what kind of growth the campaign had. One way to consider trust and confidence would be if Kickstarter had some sort of data (maybe from a survey?) asking every backer if they knew the creator before backing the project or how confident they were in the product being finished. Without the data points, it’s just pure conjecture as to why. Personally, I think it makes complete sense that people are not rushing to back a project with 0 backers twenty days into a thirty-day campaign. However, if you see something already funded or at least has good momentum to be funded, you’re more likely to participate. You don’t want to waste your time on something that will not happen.