**Module 1 Challenge – Written Component**

**Endi Hajdari**

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

1. *Campaign length* is an important factor that contributes to whether a crowdfunding campaign fails or succeeds. Moreover, based on the data provided, a longer campaign period (e.g., month-long duration) does not necessarily suggest that more people will back it and that the campaign will succeed. This suggests that there may be somewhat of a trade-off between giving people enough time to understand the campaign and providing long timelines which may result in the campaign losing momentum.
2. Based on the pivot-chart line graph produced, the number of campaigns that are successful, fail, or get canceled increase during a period in the late spring/summer months, decrease during a period in the late-summer-fall months, and stay relatively consistent during the remainder of the months. This suggests that *timing* regarding when a campaign is launched is also important.
3. Lastly, based on the stacked bar graph that breaks down the number of campaigns that were successful, unsuccessful, canceled, or live based on parent category, it seems that while the parent categories of theater, film and video, and music had the largest grand totals, the ratio of successful campaigns to unsuccessful campaigns was relatively the same amongst each category. This suggests that looking at *type of campaigns alone* is not enough to predict whether it will fail or succeed.

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

One limitation of this dataset is that it does not indicate they type of crowdfunding model each organization employed (i.e., donation-based, debt-based, rewards-based, or equity-based). This is a limitation as each model has differing levels of perceived contributor risk associated with them. For example, people may be more willing to back an organization that uses a lending/debt-based option rather than a donation-based option that provides nothing in return for their monetary contribution. Other limitations of this dataset include that the geographic location of each crowdfunding project is reported broadly (i.e., by country as opposed to say, country and region) and no information regarding demographic of backers is provided. This is a limitation because depending on the specific region of a country and the demography associated with it, certain categories of projects may do better over others. For example, in Los Angeles or New York City, more individuals may be willing to invest in a project related to theatre than individuals located in Kenai, Alaska where such category is not as popular amongst those living there. In addition to that, another limitation is that the dataset does not clearly indicate how much the organization itself/founders themselves contribute to funding the campaign. Lastly, another limitation of this dataset is that it does not provide many figures that relate to the exposure a campaign receives (e.g., the social network following of the organization/individual, platform used for the campaign, etc…).

**What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Possible Table and/or Graphs** | **Additional Value Provided** |
| Stacked bar-graph that breaks down the number of campaigns that were successful, unsuccessful, canceled, or live based on country. | Provides one measure of how big of an influence geography has in whether a crowdfunding campaign will do well or not. |
| Stacked bar-graph that breaks down the number of campaigns that were successful, unsuccessful, canceled, or live based on the length of the campaign. | Provides on measure to see if there is roughly an optimal time length for a crowdfunding campaign. |