Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median summarizes the data more meaningfully.

The median would be better to summarize the data because there were many extreme values for backers count in both successful and unsuccessful campaigns. The extreme values can be viewed as outliers which will distort the mean. For instance, the data for successful campaigns had a mean of 194 with a maximum value of 26,457, which would be viewed as an outlier.

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

There is more variability with successful campaigns because the calculated variance and standard deviation is higher than that of unsuccessful campaigns. What this means is the data for backers count for successful campaigns is spread out farther from the mean and the data for unsuccessful campaigns is concentrated closer to the mean. Yes, it makes sense because successful campaigns had a higher average number of backers than unsuccessful campaigns which is a factor why they had successful funding.