1. Conclusions

There are several conclusions we can draw from this analysis.

The overall chances of success for a campaign are 53.8%. Refer “Pivots Cat” sheet. (2185 of the 4064 projects were successful.)

The chances of failure for a campaign are 37.6%. Refer “Pivots\_Cat” sheet. (1530 of the 4064 projects were failures.)

The chances of a campaign being cancelled are 8.6%. Refer “Pivots\_Cat” sheet. (349 of the 4064 projects were cancelled.)

In analysing the outcomes of campaigns, I complemented the “Pivots\_Cat” sheet with an analysis by percentage. All of the following conclusions are based on that analysis. Please refer to the “Pivots\_Cat” sheet analysis by percentage for the data supporting the following conclusions.

The category of “theater” has the greatest chance of success at 38.3%.

The categories of “music, technology and film & video” have the next greatest chances of success at 24.7%, 13.7% and 9.6% respectively.

The categories of “food, games, photography and publishing” with success rates of 1.6%, 3.7%, 4.7% and 3.7% respectively have less chances of success compared to the more successful categories above.

The category of “journalism” has the lowest chances of success. In fact, all twenty-four “journalism” campaigns were cancelled highlighting the inherent risky nature of journalism in this day and age.

The “technology” category also has the highest overall risk of not succeeding based on the total of “canceled” and “failed” campaigns at 64.9%.

Ironically the “theater” category (the most successful category) also has a high overall risk of not succeeding based on the total of “canceled” and “failed” campaigns at 42.8%.

The “film&video, publishing and food” categories also have a moderate risk of not succeeding based on the total of “canceled” and “failed” campaigns at 23.2%, 16.9% and 14.9% respectively.

1. Limitations of the Dataset

Some of the limitations of the dataset are: -

* it only includes campaigns from the Kickstarter organisation,
* one of the datasets, “journalism”, has a relatively small sample size – 24.

It would be a useful exercise to source datasets from other organisations similar to Kickstarter to analyse how their campaigns eventuated and compare them to this analysis.

The “journalism” dataset is so small that it may not be statistically relevant.

1. Other Possible Tables or Graphs

It would be useful to analyse how long it took for Kickstarter campaigns to reach their conclusion and to break this down as in the “Pivots\_Cat” sheet. A pivot table and a chart that used Date-Created and Date-Ended could break down the number of campaigns by outcome (successful, failure, canceled). [Alas, time does not permit this analysis – VBA awaits].

If data were available, it would also be interesting to analyse how many of the successful campaigns resulted in generating sustainable, profitable companies given that a high percentage of new businesses fail. This would provide some insight into how well the campaign funds were spent.

It would also be useful to analyse datasets from other organisations similar to Kickstarter using the same techniques we have used for the Kickstarter analysis.

1. Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis for the successful and unsuccessful campaigns is presented in the following table. Refer “backers” sheet.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Backers | Successful Outcome Statistics | Unsuccessful Outcome Statistics |
|  |  |  |
| Mean | 194 | 18 |
| Median | 62 | 4 |
| Minimum | 1 | 0 |
| Maximum | 26457 | 1293 |
| Variance | 712841 | 3773 |
| Standard Deviation | 844 | 61 |
| ------------ | ------------ | --------------- |
| Quartile 1 | 36 | 1 |
| Quartile 2 | 79 | 4 |
| Quartile 3 | 186 | 12 |
|  |  |  |

The statistical analysis shows that distribution of the successful campaigns has a long, wide flat bell curve. The variance is very large compared to the rest of the measures. The numbers are widely dispersed and are far from the mean and from each other. The median at 62 would appear toward the edge of the curve and is not as representative of the dataset as the mean at 194.

The statistical analysis shows that distribution of the unsuccessful campaigns has a narrower, higher bell curve. Again, the variance is large compared to the rest of the measures. The median at 4 is closer to the centre of the bell curve than the mean of 18 which is in the third quartile. The median is more representative of the dataset than the mean.

There is more variability with successful campaigns than unsuccessful campaigns. This may be because many unsuccessful campaigns get little, or no funding as shown by the quartiles.

Intuitively, this makes sense.