1. Conclusions:
   * Campaigns in the late winter and spring have a higher rate of success than in the summer and fall. April and May have the highest number of successful campaigns, but those numbers decline sharply through the summer months and more slightly more campaigns will fail during the season.
   * The single largest category of campaigns is theater, followed distantly by music, with film & video and technology behind. A larger parent category of “fine arts” would represent the majority of all campaigns and the majority of successful campaigns (and failed campaigns but by a lesser margin).
   * Success is much more likely correlated to the sub-category than the parent category (except plays and theater which is a similar breakdown). A large number of subcategories (from this data set) have no or nearly no successful campaigns; inversely, several have mostly or entirely successful campaigns. Photobooks, spaces, and plays are some of the only subcategories with a wider spread of outcome data.
2. Limitations:
   * Incomplete data seems to exist for several categories/subcategories which creates some graphically harsh looking data. As in 1c above, many subcategories are entirely successful or unsuccessful. The data also includes an overwhelmingly large number of plays compared to any other type.
   * The data from earlier years is somewhat sparse, reflective of platform growth. Acknowledging data about Kickstarter’s popularity and user data rather than just the campaigns themselves could help us draw different conclusions about campaign success, but this information is probably guarded by privacy concerns or uncollected.
   * Unsuccessful campaigns are a large portion of the data, but it’s hard to qualify if every campaign is “valuable” data. There aren’t “tiers” for Kickstarter campaigns but looking at the range of campaign goals reveals that not every project stacks up against each other fairly.
3. Additional tables/graphs:
   * Length of campaign versus state/outcome
   * Percent funded across category/state
   * Average donation versus number of backers
   * Analysis of staff picks and/or spotlight on success

Bonus Statistical Analysis

I analyzed both failed and failed/canceled because I wasn’t sure which best described “unsuccessful”.

The mean summarizes the data better than the median.

The min-max spread of values is so large that the median values (which are all significantly smaller) don’t seem to indicate anything about the scale of the data. They might seem more useful for unsuccessful campaign statistics if they help reflect the number of 0-backer projects, but they are so far from the average that they seem poorly representative of the whole set.

There is more variability in successful campaigns. Besides directly comparing the variance values and standard deviation, successful campaigns have a much, much larger range of backer counts than unsuccessful campaigns. Unsuccessful campaigns have a heavy load of 0-backer projects which form a skewed data set, but a value of 0 is still quite close to both the median and mean value. Successful campaigns have some outlying large backer counts, but they also include many meaningful small counts, hence the median at 62, and the mean at 194. The successful data is farther spread but not in such a concentrated manner.

It is sensible that unsuccessful campaigns might have less variability due to the fact they lacked enough support and therefore had smaller counts of backers consistently, versus a high number of backers required for much larger (often successful) campaigns.