* Given the provided data, what are three conclusions that we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?

-Technology has had the highest average amount of successful crowd fundings (If we are to exclude journalism because it has only had 4 crowd fundings with a success rate of 100%)

-Theater has had the most crowd fundings but not the highest success rate

-Plays have a substantially high amount of crowd funding compared to every other sub-category

* What are some limitations of this dataset?

Some of there are substantial high amount of crowd fundings for some while others can have only a few crowd fundings. The spread of our data isn’t even and this can skew a lot of the data.

* What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?

The next best graph we could use in this scenario is the scatterplot. We could use the scatterplot to see if there are any relationships between two variables like dates, categories etc. Another good graph to use is a pie graph. Pie graphs can be another way to see how distributed our data is.

* Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median better summarizes the data.

For this dataset I’d say the median is the best measurement for center because this data has a lot of outliers that can skew it. This data has a lot of numbers that can have extreme ranges from hundreds to the thousands and this can skew the mean a lot.

* Use your data to determine if there is more variability with successful or unsuccessful campaigns. Does this make sense? Why or why not?

Successful variance is almost 2 times more than the failed variance. The reason for this might be because failed crowd fundings tend to be more constant than successful crowd fundings. Successful crowd funding can vary in their donations, they can be in the hundreds or the thousands they are inconsistent and can skew are beliefs in how to make a successful crowd funding.