**Introduction**

The overall analysis of the data shows that the sample of pledges in the original dat ai snot uniform by year or by country. Including all countries, there is a significant increase in the number of pledges from 2009 to 2014:

Figure 1. Number of pledges per country.

1. Most of the countries are only reported between 2014 to 2016
2. The declining number of pledges in all countries for 2017 seems to indicate that the data for that year is incomplete
3. The number of pledges seems to be more consistent and higher only for 2014-2016
4. Four countries make 90% of the total pledges for the period 2014-2016:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | US | GB | CA | AU |
| % of pledges 2014-2016 | 69% | 17% | 4% | 2% |

Table 1. % of pledges for US, GB, CA and AU (2014-2015)

The commentaries for the analysis will focus on these four countries and for 2014-2016 since the data seems to be more complete.

**Given the provided data, what are three conclusions we can draw about Kickstarter campaigns?**

1. Total annual pledge in successful campaings shows different trends in the the five countries:
   1. US with increasing trend of pledge amount betwwe 2014-2015
   2. Other countries with flat or declining pledged amounts

Figure 2. Pledge totals per year per country (US, AU, GB, CA ) for 2014-2016 (totals for GB, AU and CA are plotted against the secondary vertical exis)

* 1. Decrease of pledge amount in the GB is driven mainly by significant drop in the amounts collected from technology related campaigns: 1.1 M BB in 2014 to 60K in 2015.
  2. The decline for technology in UK is not related to lower amount of campaigns in 2015 (a total of 190K in 2014 and 274K in 2015).
  3. Despite the increase in the number of campaigns, the proportion of successful, failed and canceled campaings shows a siignificant increase YoY for canceled campaigns:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **state** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| **technology** | successful | 41.99% | 42.73% | 39.44% |
|  | failed | 31.21% | 17.65% | 24.57% |
|  | canceled | 26.80% | 39.62% | 35.98% |

Table 2. % of campaigns according to the state for Technology-DE

* 1. There is a significant drop of number of backers YoY (32% decrease), especially for successful campaings) and also an increase in the number of canceled campaigns:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **state** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| **technology** | successful | 26909 | 16883 | 29222 |
|  | failed | 1753 | 1216 | 2697 |
|  | canceled | 955 | 2222 | 4103 |
| **Grand Total** |  | **29617** | **20321** | **36022** |

Table 3. Number of backers for technology pledges (Germany)

1. The total pledge amount for succesful campaigns in the US jumps 22% in 2016 when compared to 2015 in the US. The increase is driven mainly by 3 sectors: Technology (81% increase YoY) and to a lesser degree to Games (31% YoY) and Food (53% YoY)

Figure 3. Amount pledge by category US

The increase in technology is not due to an increase in the number of campaigns YoY. However, there are two factors that can explain the increase: A significant increase (doublefold) of the number of backers in overall and succesful campaiggs in 2016 in a year the number of campaigns launched drop 12%. One important aspect is that topics (using the label name in the original data) seems to indicate that 2016 were conducted as new categories or programs in 2016.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Year Created** | **Count of id** | **Sum of backers\_count** |
| 2014 | 102 | 18669 |
| 2015 | 136 | 15707 |
| 2016 | 124 | 32531 |
| **Grand Total** | **362** | **66907** |
| **YoY 2015-2016** | **-9%** | **107%** |

Table 4. Numbers of campaigns and backer per year for Technology in US

1. Regarding the subcategories driving the increase in Technology campaigns the US YoY between 2015-2016, hardware shows a two-fold increase (177% YoY). On the other hand, Germany pladge amount for hardware drops significantly in 2015 and never recover to previous levels.

Table 1. % of successful and failed campaigns in US by category

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

1. There is not information about coverage in each country. Was the whole population or what % of the population contacted for the campaigns? Regional vs. National
2. There is no information about number of staff, number of contacts or intensity of the campaigns, max contribuition per campaign or a degree in the variability. For example, GB shows an icrease in campaigns YoY in Technology between 2014-2015 but the pledge amount descreases. Is it that less people were contacted?
3. Timing of campaigns. For example in GB the peask of contacts and pledges was 2014. Were the same campaigns done in the US in 2016 or the US had a significant increase in the topics that these campaigns touched (which seems to be seen from the blub despription.
4. There is no complete 2017 data that will allow assess whether hardware campaigns will suffer the same decrease as in GB in 2017 after a very successful year 2016.
5. Further characterization of the hardware segments that are being campaigned.
6. Defition of state: 4 campaings were canceled despite having 100% or more of % of funding (one even has $1M pledge (goal was 5K).
7. Information on how the goals is defined. We are using succesful as one possible indicator for analyzing the data. However, as the bonus section indicates, the highest the goal, the lower the probability of success.
8. Backers count is one good metric to get an average. However, we do not know if they were targeting only individual or corporations. Technology is a good field where companies related to the technology area might contribute to expose and get publicity or good image.

**What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create?**

Note: Please refer to the tables in the Excel homerwork file (Additional views tab) for pivots and charts for the commentary.

With the defitinion of specific areas (for example in technology), how they change per year and country.

Views to identify changes in the success of campaigns through time.