Create a report in Microsoft Word and answer the following questions.

1. Given the provided data, what are three conclusions we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?
2. Count of, and most and least successful campaign by category

There were 9 categories of funding campaigns corresponding to a total of a 1000 fundraising projects. The most numerous in terms of numbers was ‘theater’ (all being ‘plays’) with 344 projects, and the least was ‘journalism’ with four. However, in terms of the proportion of these projects which were successful, journalism projects scored highest with 100%, with the second place going to ‘technology’ projects at 66.67%. The least successful category was ‘games’ (mobile and video games) at 43.75%.

1. Most and least successful campaign by country.

In terms of identifying areas where successful factors could be replicated and less successful ones avoided, analysing the countries where the fundraising projects were conducted could be useful to find patterns of such factors. Fundraising projects were carried out across 7 countries. However, over 70% of all projects over all fundraising categories were conducted in the United States. Each of the other countries only had less than 5% of fundraising projects. Considering that both the most and least successful categories were held in the United States, in this case, the most insightful lessons are likely to be learnt from America per se.

1. Most and least successful campaign by year

Although there was no obvious year-on-(complete)-year trend in terms of total number of fundraising projects launched (108 in 2010, and 107 in 2019), there is an increasing (albeit slow) trend in terms projects which are successful occurring over the period of this analysis, with there being 58 in 2010, and 67 in 2019 (corresponding to 53.7% and 62.62% of campaigns launched in those years respectively).

1. What are some limitations of this dataset?

Answer:

1. I would need to check the veracity of the values that constitute the ‘successful’ category in the dataset. Specifically, the outcome variable is undefined though it seems to be tied to funding being at least 100% of the funding goal having successfully been pledged. However, we are aware that pledges do not necessarily translate to actual funds transferred, so I would like to assess whether the analysis of successful projects would vary in any way with actual funds received measured against the funding target.

1. Not having any specific interventions/techniques/approaches of the actual fundraising campaigns recorded in the dataset is a setback. We don’t know how the campaigners approached potential donors: whether the campaign was conducted by phone, leaflet, online, or face to face, etc. We don’t know the location or setting where it was conducted (house to house, fairs, direct donations, etc)?. We don’t know what form the donations were given as: direct fund transfers, rents (fair or stall tables or tents), lotteries etc? We also don’t know the lengths of these funding arrangements: direct debits, one off and so on. The granularity of the exact and specific method of fundraising could determine its success (or failure), which could be learnt from and applied across future projects and different countries.
2. What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?

Answer:

1. Proportion of Successful projects by Length of project (date ended(ie deadline)-date launched). As the resources in many projects are financial, availability of trained manpower, and time, perhaps the length allocated to projects could be a factor in a fundraising project.
2. Details on campaign techniques. As noted above, having this information could help determine which methods work best.
3. Details on the extent that pledged funds are actually funded, when done together with information on methods of fundraising noted above, could be a useful assessment of the success of fundraising projects.