1. Given the provided data, what are three conclusions we can draw about Kickstarter campaigns? Explain the reasoning behind your answers.
   * **Spotlights** are very influential. A campaign receiving a spotlight can practically guarantee it will be successful. Out of the 2185 listed as being given a spotlight, **100%** ended up being successful.
   * Kickstarter campaigns are **overall successful**. From the data given, **53%** of campaigns are successful, though only 7 of 21 countries showed more success than failures/cancellations.
   * The biggest (a.k.a. only) winners in terms of category are **Film & Video**, **Music**, and **Theater**. Each of these three categories posted success rates **over 50%** and were notably the only three categories to have more successes than failures or cancelations. However, **Music** shows to be the most successful, with not only the highest success percentage, but a whopping **286%** (almost 3x) **more** successes than failures and cancelations.
2. What are some limitations of this dataset?
   * This dataset only runs through 2017. It is almost 2022, so this data is almost 5 years old. While it *does* span almost 10 years (2009 – 2017), a lot has changed about the internet, the world, and how crowd-funding fits in our society.
   * The data does not show any demographics of campaign owners or donors. While dollars are usually the most influential data point for a company, in the last 5-10 years, demographic data has become very important. Knowing exactly who is using your service can greatly influence who to target and how.
3. What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?
   * There are *many* ways to observe and slice the data. You can examine the percentage of total donations by category, which campaigns raised the most money with least number of backers, or which campaigns raised the most money and still failed. Any of these viewpoints could be built with a table and displayed with a graph.
   * These three examples would provide valuable perspective of which categories the userbase cares about, what the userbase is willing to spend money on, or why some campaigns have failed. Understanding these analyses would offer insight into how Kickstarter can continue reaching the groups that want to use the platform *and* how to continue breeding success from their campaigns. Kickstarter succeeds when the campaigns it hosts succeed.
4. (BONUS) Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median summarizes the data more meaningfully.
   * I think that for both the successful and failed columns, the median summarizes the central tendency best. With such a high variance, the median reveals just how skewed the data is, that half of all successful campaigns had 62 or less backers, even though the max was over 26,000 backers.
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?
   * There is less variability with the failed campaigns. This does make sense because generally, more backers will equal more donations, which will greatly increase the chance of meeting the goal.