Key Conclusion:

* Crowdfunding campaigns are more often successful than unsuccessful.
* Crowdfunding campaigns show more success in June and July.
* Crowdfunding campaigns are used substantially more for plays and theater compared to other uses.

Limitations:

* Data is all relatively recent, coming from the past 15 years. Trends would be easier to examine with more longitudinal data.
* There’s no information on whether the money received ultimately resulted in a success or not (i.e., Did the product or project actually succeed?). It would be helpful/interesting to know if people were successfully funding ventures that worked.
* Even with the category descriptors and sub-category descriptors, the information on exactly what was being funded/not-funded was limited. Could there be more useful information in sub-sub-categories?
* As a diversity analyst, I always suggest demographic info. Were there any differences by age, race, gender, etc.?

Other Analyses:

* Cross tabs of percentage of funding and how that correlated to how many backers the project had.
* Length of time the crowdfunding operated compared to success of the operation.

Final Questions:

* The mean is more influenced by non-normality, extreme scores, and outliers. Both successful and failed data show significant skew. Because of this, the median, which is less influenced by non-normality, would be the better option for both.
* Successful campaigns have a higher standard deviation (SD=1267) compared to unsuccessful campaigns (SD=961). Therefore, there’s potentially more variability in successful campaigns. However, Levene’s test for equality of variances is needed to know if the variation is statistically significant between the two.