Brandy Knust

1. KickStarter campaigns seem to have a wide range of success and/or failure, but there are some conclusions to be drawn from them.

1. Successful campaigns tend to happen more often at towards the beginning of the year than at the end of the year.
2. Music, theater, and film tend to be more successful categories than other categories, but not all subcategories within those are equally successful.
3. More specific types of music, like rock or Indie, are more successful than others, as are documentaries and plays for film and theater respectively.

2. There are many limitations to this data set. With different types of Kickstarter campaigns come different types of possibilities for the contributor. For example, music or film creators need money for production, so need the start-up money in the first place. Once they get an album or film made however, getting a copy or a few out to some people, i.e. their contributors, can serve as free marketing. Therefor they can tell contributors they will get a copy if they pledge a certain amount. Win-win. Same with Plays; they can get a free ticket with a certain pledge. Other campaigns, though, may lose money if they offer all contributors the same type of “reward”. If you are producing a product, you have costs involved for each object you make. So to promise each pledger a product might require a larger pledge, thereby reducing the amounts of pledges.

Another limitation of this data is that some of the different categories don’t have as much data because they don’t have as much need to get funding. For example, journalism may be more traditionally funded through other sources, like magazines or media companies. There was very little data for that. There aren’t very many projects for photography either, because most photographers have specialized jobs, and they get paid for their services, therefor there isn’t the need for as many campaigns.

Another example would be with things like the food category. Most of those types of operations need a larger amount of money and need to go through banks to get enough money to get off the ground in the first place. It is likely that people look at large amounts of needed campaign amounts and think that they were probably turned down for a loan from a bank, and that might have been for a good reason, and they don’t want to give money to that type of campaign.

3. Some other possible tables and/or graphs that could be created from this data might include information about the average number of backers per state of projects. Also, the average amount of donation per project state could give details about if some projects had higher amounts of donations, but maybe that led to fewer donations. If you looked at the two combined, it could lead to very interesting insights.

Bonus

The median in the statistical analysis would provide more meaningful information in this case. There was a project with 26,457 backers that was successful, which drove the mean up considerably, but there was also a successful project with only one backer. There was also a project that failed with 1293 backers, but the median for failed projects was 4. With those outliers, the mean is not as reliable of a measure.

There is much more variability with successful campaigns, but some of that is because of the fact that a few of the campaigns had well over 20000 backers. Failed campaigns tended to have few backers in the first place, so there is less variability possible with fewer backers. With some of the successful campaigns, they could be for small amounts and been successful with one generous donor. With other projects, they could have been large projects, but gained in popularity and had huge amounts of backers. With failed campaigns, the problem tends to be not enough backers, so there is less variability when you are actually looking at the number of backers.