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

The most obvious data point is that categories related to media such as film & video, music, and theater, dominate the total volume of all crowd funding categories. The second is that the sub category, plays, accounts for 1/3 of all fundraisers. The rate of success varies by category and sub category, but more than 50% of all fund raisers met their goal. More fund raisers are successful in late spring and early summer than other times of the year.

What are some limitations of this dataset?

This data is missing a lot of external factors that could influence success. Was there a viral social media campaign that this crowd funding activity got wrapped up in? Was it headed up by a famous person? Did it have an accompanying social cause that was popular at the time?

The scale of the campaigns varies a lot. Not only are some orders of magnitude larger than others, the different currencies makes the values even more difficult to compare. The data should be normalized to one currency and then scale considered both in a per category basis and overall.

Several fields, such as name, blurb, staff pick, and spotlight are unexplained and also not intuitive to infer. The blurbs especially look unrelated to the parent and sub categories of their rows. Understanding what those fields are could help better analyze the data.

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

* Analyzing outcomes by country or currency would inform if the results are skewed based on location.
* Understanding success over time (as opposed to success by month in the third pivot) would help to understand if crowd funding is getting more or less popular / possible.
* A graph that breaks down stats for funds that had high goals in dollar values and met them. Could help determine factors for success.