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

1. The top three types of crowdfunding campaigns by category are theater, film and video, and music.
2. The top subcategory is plays, which is within the theater category.
3. The US has the largest number of campaigns.
4. There are fewer failed campaigns than successful ones.

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

The larger portion of US campaigns could skew the datasets toward a regional bias. We do not know where in the US the campaigns were, for example, if this takes place in New York near Broadway we could unintentionally draw incorrect conclusions. The dates are also exact, which makes it difficult to chart the information. To make sense of it I had to add quarters and months to the pivot table, but this lumps all the years together unless filtering directly to each year. There is only one campaign in January 2020, so when looking at 2020 as a whole year this could skew our conclusions if only looking at the years.

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

Assuming we are wanting to know what makes campaigns successful or what makes them fail it could be interesting to compare the number of backers, the duration of the campaign, as well as the average donation of the backer to the success rate and locations as well. Perhaps more successful campaigns have fewer backers that provide more money suggesting you need to target specific populations, or the reverse with successful campaigns having a larger number of backers with smaller donations. Maybe the longer the campaign the more likely to succeed because people were given enough time, or maybe extending the length doesn’t drive enough urgency so people are more likely to think they’ll do it later and forget altogether. A stacked bar for comparison could be good to get a quick look at these two measures when compared to success, and a line chart with trends highlighted might be able to show us if there are correlations between the above measures as well. All these measures could help us start to draw conclusions about what could make or break a campaign.

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

If appears that we have very high outliers skewing the mean of the dataset, so in this case the median would better summarize the data.

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

The variance is higher for successful campaigns than for failed campaigns, but looking at the datasets they seem comparable (bar and whisker). This makes sense because there is a set goal for achieving success, but there is no limit to the number of backers and donations that can be received. So, the datasets for both would be less consistent. This may indicate that the number of backers alone is not a good measure for success and perhaps we should look at the average donations received compared to the success.