1. **Given the provided data, what are three conclusions we can draw about Kickstarter campaigns?**
   1. The top three most successful kickstarter categories across all years and countries are: music (77.14%), theater (60.23%), and film & video (57.69%).
   2. The top three most successful kickstarter months across all years and countries are: May (60.62%), Feb (60.30%), and Apr (59.81%).
   3. Within the game category across all years and countries, every mobile and video game project failed, but every board game project was successful.
2. **What are some limitations of this dataset?**
   1. The data does not track the marketing efforts of each project, either on the kickstarter page itself or on other avenues like social media, word of mouth, or print.
   2. The data does not track the amount of web traffic each project had. We are thus unable to measure conversion rates or number of click throughs, which would be a useful metric.
   3. The data does not track the credibility, reputation, or project history of the project owners. For example, it is possible that a well-known board game publisher with repeated successful kickstarters would have higher success rates when compared to first-timers.
3. **What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create?**
   1. Duration of project by average donation
      1. Could potentially show the optimal duration for a project to be live in order to reach their goals.
   2. Success rate of projects that were stack picked and/or spotlighted compared to projects that were not.
      1. Could potentially show the impact of stack-pick and spotlighted on the success rate of projects.
   3. Size of initial goal by success rate and country
      1. Could potentially show which countries seem more willing to invest in small, medium, or large kickstarter goals.
4. **(Bonus) Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median summarizes the data more meaningfully.**
   1. In data sets with very high standard deviations, I believe the mean is the worse metric because it is more affected by extreme outliers and the spread of the data. Thus, I believe the median is a better metric for both the successful and unsuccessful categories, which both have high standard deviations.
5. **(Bonus) Use your data to determine if there is more variability with successful or unsuccessful campaigns. Does this make sense? Why or why not?**
   1. Unsurprisingly, there is more variability with successful campaigns. A campaign that has reached 100% of its fundraising goal is categorized similarly to a campaign that has reached 1000% of its fundraising goal—they are both “successful”. As such, the data does not differentiate between these different types of projects.
   2. Additionally, unsuccessful campaigns have raised between 0 to under 100%, while successful ones have raised between 100% to infinity. There is no boundary to successful projects, but there is one for unsuccessful ones.