**Conclusions**

1. **Funding Success:** Not all campaigns meet their funding goals. Some campaigns receive pledges that fall short of their targets, highlighting the challenges in achieving crowdfunding success.

2. **Category Influence:** Certain sub-categories attract more funding than others, suggesting that some types of projects are more appealing to backers.

3. **Variable Success Rates:** The success rate percentage varies across different campaigns, indicating that factors such as goal amount, duration, average pledge, and number of backers play a role in determining whether a campaign will meet its goals.

**Limitations**

1. **No Temporal Analysis:** While the dataset includes launch and deadline dates, the provided data does not allow for a detailed temporal analysis. Understanding how funding progresses over time could reveal critical periods for campaign success and identify trends in backer behaviour.

2. **Lack of Qualitative Data:** The dataset primarily contains quantitative metrics such as goal amounts, pledged amounts, and number of backers. It lacks qualitative data that could provide deeper insights into why certain campaigns succeeded or failed, such as campaign descriptions, marketing strategies, or backer comments.

3. Geographical Context: Although the dataset includes currency information, it does not provide detailed geographical context such as the country of origin for each campaign. This limits the ability to analyse regional trends and understand how location might impact crowdfunding success.

**Additional Tables and Graphs**

1. **Histogram of Campaign Durations:** A histogram showing the distribution of campaign durations could provide insights into optimal campaign lengths. Comparing the durations of successful and failed campaigns might reveal patterns.

2. **Table Categorizing Campaigns by Country:** A table categorizing campaigns by country (based on currency provided on the Crowdfunding data sheet) could highlight general geographical trends in crowdfunding success rates.

3. **Pie Chart of Category Distribution:** A pie chart representing the proportion of each category within all campaigns would highlight which areas attract more crowdfunding efforts.

**Mean vs. Median: Which Better Summarizes the Data?**

**Justification**

* **Mean:** The mean is useful when the data distribution is symmetrical and there are no outliers. It provides a single value that represents the average of all data points.
* **Median:** The median is more robust in the presence of skewed data or outliers. It represents the middle value of the dataset, providing a better measure of central tendency when the data is not symmetrically distributed.

Given the variability in the dataset, particularly with the presence of both successful and failed campaigns, the median is likely a better measure to summarize the data. This is because the median is not affected by extreme values or outliers, which are common in crowdfunding data where some campaigns may significantly exceed their goals while others fall short.

**Variability Analysis**

* **Successful Campaigns:** Tend to have a more concentrated range of goals and pledged amounts, indicating less variability.
* **Failed Campaigns:** Exhibit a broader range of goals and pledged amounts, indicating more variability.

This suggests that there is more variability with unsuccessful campaigns, making the median a more reliable measure for summarizing the central tendency of the data.