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

A:

1. Theater make up the majority of crowdfunding campaigns based on the parent categories. It easily outpaced the second most common crowdfunding category, film and video by 166 campaigns over the year. Theater nearly has as many campaigns as the second and third most common categories combined (344 to 353)!
   1. When you break this down further by sub-categories and realize theater only consists of plays, then the popularity of theater/plays becomes even more obvious. With its 344 total campaigns, plays outpaces the second most popular sub-category, rock music, by 259 campaigns. (344 to 85)
2. 57.3% of all campaigns throughout this year were successful, compared to 36.9% of campaigns failing and another 5.8% being canceled.
3. June and July are the peak months for successful campaigns. Coming in higher than the yearly averages of 47 per month with June registering 55 and July with 58.

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

A:

* For these first sets of pivot tables we pulled, I think we need total percentages of failed/successful per month as well as the percentages for failed and successful per category and sub-category.

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

A:

* I think pulling a table/chart focused on the time a campaign was active, vs. success rate would be interesting. Do the longer campaigns have higher success rates as they allow time to reach the goal? Or do longer campaigns suffer from lack of engagement over time and fail more often? Does the goal amount directly correlate to campaign length?

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

A:

* I believe the mean best summarizes the data being the higher number as the data sets have a wide range of values from 0 to 7,295. The median values seem too low to best describe this data set.

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

A:

* The data suggests there is more variability with successful campaigns with a standard deviation of 1,251 compared to 965 for failed campaigns. Looking at the data in total it does make sense to me that it would be this way when you consider that 57.3% of all campaigns were successful compared to 36.9% that failed. This would give the successful data set a larger and more varied data pool by its sheer advantage in size.