Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median better summarizes the data.  
Given the large range between the minimum and maximum backer counts for both successful (7,279) and failed (6,080), this would skew the mean. In this case, the median would be your better option for a true summarization of data.

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 more variability in the data for the successful backer count. The data set itself has a larger pool, compared to the failed count, so you have more records to create a bigger difference. The mean and median vary more between the successful backers than they do the failed backers. The minimum and maximum range is higher as well. The standard deviation for successful backers is also larger than that of the failed backers. Given all of that, I believe it does make sense that the successful campaigns have more variability.