**What are three conclusions we can make about Kickstarter campaigns given the provided data?**

1. Staff picks do not necessarily result in increases in funding: On average, staff picks received 722% percent of their requested funding while campaigns not picked by staff received nearly 1,000% of the requested funding. The difference is more apparent when looking at if the project was successful: Successful campaigns not picked by staff received more than 2,000% of their funding level, while successful campaigns picked by staff received more than 800 percent of desired funding levels. This brings us to conclusion 2.
2. There is some dirt or at least misleading data in the set. Campaigns where the goal amount is less than or equal to $200 make up about two percent of the dataset (68 cases). However, the average amount pledged to these campaigns is more than 1100 percent. One campaign in particular is really impacting the average: Suburban Legends album had a goal of $10, but brought in more than $30,000. This one case really impacts the average, bringing it artificially high. In short, this case is an outlier and is making the average artificially high.
3. The third conclusion to be drawn is being in the spotlight has an impact on funding: campaigns in the spotlight received about 1,800 percent of their goals. Campaigns not in the spotlight received about 21 percent of their goals. It should be noted two categories did cause the average to go higher than it would if used median as a metric (games received more than 12,000% of its goals and technology received 11,000%) however the data still suggests being in the spotlight does result in higher funding.

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

We don’t know how or why these cases were chosen: was this data set randomly selected from the whole? Does it matter? We also don’t know a lot if anything about the whom is submitting the campaign. We know the name of the campaign and a brief synopsis but not much else. Are the successful campaigns being launched by the same people? What are the ways in which these campaigns are being marketed, outside of the spotlight or staff pick fields? Do any of these factors matter? We also don’t know when the project hit its goal, just if the goal was hit. Being able to know if a campaign is likely to hit its goal in the first three weeks would be useful. We also do not know how quickly the money was raised, just the length of the campaign. Knowing a lot of money comes in at launch or right after being a spotlight or staff pick would be helpful. Also knowing what determines if the campaign becomes a staff pick or is spotlight would be useful in determining what makes a campaign successful.

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

In terms of funding, box plots would be helpful in identifying the outliers which are really bringing up the average and showing how many campaigns have relatively modest funding needs. Another interesting chart would be a scatter (X Y) chart with the category and sub-category as the x and Y axis, and the amount funded along with the spotlight, number of backers, a dummy variable of where the campaign reached its goal and staff picks as part of the regression analysis. Finally, a chart showing the length of time each project took from launch to deadline and where the point of success (or failure) is would be helpful. Line charts with labels noting when the funding goal was achieved would be useful as well.

Bonus Chart: State, by Percentage, and Fund Grouping  
