Crowdfunding Campaign Conclusions

* Given the provided data, what are three conclusions that we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?
  + The three conclusions that I see are that 1) Performance art draws in the most donations with theater, music and film being the most successful campaigns; 2) Other campaigns that involved food and games had surprisingly lower engagement; 3) Journalism may be a route to consider dropping during the next crowdfunding event due to there being low to no engagement.
* What are some limitations of this dataset?
  + The data doesn’t account for other factors that could not be measured within a graph, such as what plays/theater productions were performed vs which journalism outlets were or weren’t available; depending on the show and how big of a headliner the artist or play is makes a huge difference in how successful a campaign is. On the flip side, since journalism, games and food weren’t so successful the graph does not explain why. What kind of food was provided, what kind of games were played/offered, which journalists or journalism connections did they have and were limited to? These are some of the limitations to this data set.
* What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?
  + We could create pie charts that would show some of the bigger connections between the data. For example, I find it difficult with the current graphs to recognize what happened each year of these crowdfunding campaigns. I think a pie chart could illustrate this better, a pie chart could also help to provide a more pronounced visual to how much money was raised comparatively to each campaign.

Statistical Analysis

* Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median better summarizes the data.
  + I think the mean better summarizes the data because it shows the average amount of campaigns that were successful or that have failed, the median gives us more of a full picture of where the results land. The median tells us where the middle point of the data is, but it does not illustrate the full scope of the data in the same way that a mean, or average does.
* 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 the successful campaigns rather than the failed campaigns. This does make sense when you look at other graphs within the data, you can clearly see on the stack-column pivot table that theater plays were the most successful. The success was by far disproportionate to all other campaigns as it was the campaign that was most engaged with, even with failed campaigns.