Crowd Funding Reflection

Three Conclusions: It is safe to say that based on this data on the graphs sorted by Parent Category and Sub-Category, when “failed” projects are compared to the “successful” projects, the “failed” were close or the same as the total of “successful” projects. The sub-category for “Plays” had the most data out of any of the other sub-categories. And it appears that the more backers there were for a project, the more likely the projects were to be “successful”.

Limitations: This data is not entirely complete as there are “live” projects. As well as the data is spread over different countries, so the currency may not match up when converted. Being that there is a “currency” column, one might assume that the data is converted to all be consistent with one currency conversion.

Possibilities: It would be best to have this data converted to one currency to eliminate any confusion regarding how much the backers pledged for their projects. And a graph showing how each parent category’s sub-categories scored against each other. This would allow the ability to see which subcategories fared better than others from the same parent category. Being that the graphs we created had all the sub-categories together, it clumps a lot of data on to one graph and it would be best to spread it out.

Mean or Median?: In conclusion, the mean appears to better summarize the data. The graph, “Crowdfunding by Category” shows that the “failed” projects are fairly close in total to those that were “successful” at reaching their goal. The means for both respectively are 585 and 851. They clearly show more data in terms of range as compared to the medians which are 114 and 201. The mean better captures the total of backers by showing the viewer that the “failed” projects were more than half of the amount of the “successful” projects. By viewing the median, it appears that the total of backers for the “failed” projects were almost half of those that were “successful”, which is not true.