1. Given the data found regarding the crowdfunding campaigns, one conclusion to come across is that the category that has been successfully funded is technology. This is only category (with 5 or more data points) that has been able to be funded more than twice the number of failed attempts to crowdfund. This leads us to believe that technology based crowdfunding projects are the most likely to reach their backing goals and be successful in garnering the amount necessary to begin the project. In fact, over the entire date range of this data set, there has never been more failed technology project than successful ones.
2. A second conclusion that can be seen using this data is that the category of games is the least likely to be successfully crowd funded. Games has had more failed attempts than that of their successful ones. However, looking at more recent trends, Game categories have been more likely to be successful in the more recent time of the data set rather than the earlier half. This leads us to believe that as time goes on, mor game-oriented crowdfunding projects will be successfully funded than the earlier years of this data set.
3. A third conclusion that can be drawn on this data set is that the US has the most crowdfunded projects compared to the rest of the countries in this data set. This can be used to deduce that American interests and influence has affected the data, and that range of categories are inherently skewed toward us data as opposed to other international crowd funders.
4. A Key limitation of the data set is that it has a large US bias. This data set is also not current and is missing the most recent years data.
5. One thing to look at would be the relationship between category and subcategory and how mixing ideas can lead to either success or increased failure rates on the crowdfunding. Another possible graph would be the trends of categories over time, to see if crowdfunding projects have gone towards other categories opposed to when the data set started.
6. Using the data from the successful and failed backers count, It can be seen that the median is a better use than the average to determine the central measurement of backers. This is because there are some high backer count outliers that inflate the average to large amount. The variance is significantly higher for failed campaigns opposed to successful one. This does make sense as it can be seen that failed campaigns average and median measurement is lower, and the ability to hit and/or exceed the backer count goal is needed to have a higher chance of succeeding.