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

Conclusion 1. Theater is the most common parent category present in the data.

The crowdfunding data demonstrated the most common crowdfunding campaign category involves the “theater” parent category with “plays” being the most common subcategory. This was the case for each country when the data is evaluated for individual countries and combined countries.

Conclusion 2. Journalism has the highest success rate of any parent category.

While theater was consistently the most popular parent category across countries, it did not present the highest success rate. The data showed that the journalism category has a success rate of one-hundred percent. It is important to note that the journalism category presents only four campaigns while theater presents 344 campaigns total.

Conclusion 3. The given data does not show signs of deterioration of the crowdfunding campaign option.

The timestamp data shows that the years with the highest number of crowd funding campaigns studied include the years 2010 and 2019. The data set includes data from roughly the end of 2010 to the beginning of 2020. It can thereby be concluded that the crowdfunding campaigning has not seen signs of reduction or growth in popularity, but has maintained its utility across the years with variation along the way.

**What are some limitations of this dataset?**

The research shows only a sample size of the crowdfunding data. Drawing major conclusions would require further inquiry and repeated research methods to confirm the findings in this data sample. Furthermore, the data is limited in the number of years covered as the most recent years are not included in the data. Additionally, there is limited information on the collection methods of the chosen sample. Further evaluation of the collection methods is necessary to ensure limited bias. Similarly, the data does not differentiate between the crowdfunding options. For example, the data could have been pulled from a crowd funding site that sets a major focus on crowdfunding for theater specifically which would skew the overall findings. Further information into the sample collection is therefore necessary. The data also need to be evaluated for the categorization requirements. For example, the “music” parent category was split into subcategories such as “metal,” and “jazz.” For comparison, however, the “theater” parent category only had one subcategory defined as “plays.” “Plays” could be considered a broad category and it potentially could be split into subcategories such as “historical plays” and “musical theater.” Without further evaluation of the categorization, any conclusions would need to be drawn with caution. For example, earlier the author described the sub-category of “theater” (“plays”) as being the most common category across countries. At the same time, however, this is not necessarily a fair comparison as the category might not have been as subcategorized as the other parent categories. The categorization methods would need to be compared to current scholarly articles and primary literature in order to determine if conclusions can be drawn from the data as to the categories and success of one category over another on crowdfunding campaigns. Similarly, the start and end date may be different between projects. Issue may arise with the validity of conclusions when one project is “successful” after a long period of time while a different project is “failed” after just a short time. One would have more time than the other project to raise the funds and this could skew the data.

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

In order to evaluate the crowdfunding campaign outcomes, the categories would need to be evaluated against one another. For example, there should be data tables and graphs that show what percent of theater projects fail and what percent of journalism fail (for example). Comparing the different parent categories and subcategories against one another could present valuable insight into the success rates of the categories and which categories have the highest success rate compared to others.

Another graph or table could show the pledged amounts across categories. Currently, the data tables show the categories against the outcomes. A pivot table that shows the pledged amounts against the categories could show which categories gain the most funding. For example, there were some projects that present a “success” outcome but in reality far exceeded the set goal. A table that shows this comparison across categories could be helpful in setting crowd funding expectations.

**Does the mean or the median better summarize the data?**

The median better summarizes the data. In both the successful and failed outcome data, the standard deviation is high. This means that there is a greater variance between the data points and the data is not very clustered around the mean. Therefore, the median better summarizes the data.

**Is there more variability with successful or unsuccessful campaigns? Does this make sense? Why or why not?**

There is more variability around the successful campaigns than the failed campaigns. The standard deviation was high in both cases, but especially in the successful outcome data. This makes sense because each successful project might require a few backers or many backers. On the other hand, a failed outcome would likely have few backers, and therefore the more consistently small number of backers across the failed crowdfunding campaigns would see less variation in backers.