Conclusion:

1. From PivotTable 1. More than half of the projects in the sample were successful, crowdfunding platforms did help a lot of companies/ people to get funds.
2. From PivotTable 2. The most funding seekers were in the “plays” field.
3. From PivotTable 3. There is no evidence shows a significant influence from month/ year to projects.

Limitations:

1. There is no unified currency unit used to compare the goal of different projects.
2. There is no note for category “staff\_ pick” and “spotlight”, we cannot utilize and dig from them.
3. The data missed information about different crowdfunding platforms, we could not find different patterns between platforms, and their influences on projects.

Other tables:

We could build a series tables for various category following the table we built in Goal Analysis. By so, we could tell the “percentage successful” for a certain category under different goal ranges, and crowdfunding seekers from that certain category could refer it to know what “percentage successful” they will have based on their goal, they could modify their goal to a close one with higher “percentage successful” if it’s needed.