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

1. When you start a crowdfunding campaign, they have a very wide range of mix results, our dataset reveals that campaigns can experience success, failure, or even cancellation, indicating that crowdfunding can be a precarious venture, with not every campaign reaching its desired funding targets.
2. The level of competition within a category can impact a campaign's success rate. If there are many similar campaigns within a category, it may be harder to stand out and attract backers.
3. The data shows a significant variation in average donation amounts across different campaigns, with contributions ranging from a couple of dollars to several thousand dollars. This implies that campaigns providing more substantial rewards may appeal to wealthier individuals, potentially drawing in more generous supporters.

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

There is incomplete data, the dataset does not provide information on every aspect of a campaign, such as marketing strategies and the details behind what sort of team with experience are running each campaign.

The data set also does not provide context for the campaigns or the backers, such as their motivations for supporting a particular campaign or the social and cultural factors that may influence their decision-making. This can be a strong indicator in knowing if the backer is going to donate again or was a one off.

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

1. We could create a separate sheet that shows the average pledge amount by country. A table or bar graph showing the average pledge amount by country could provide more insights into which countries have the most generous backers and which countries may be more challenging to attract pledges from. We can then avoid country’s that don’t pledge enough.
2. We could also create a line graph showing the trend of campaigns launched over time, this could provide insights into the popularity of crowdfunding and how it has changed over the years, whether it is as successful as it once was or whether we need to change the way we crowdfund.
3. We could use histogram or a box plot showing the distribution of pledge amounts across all campaigns, this could provide insights into the typical range of pledge amounts and the distribution of backers across the campaign.

**Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median better summarizes the data:**

The median might be a better choice in this case because there are various categories, such as theatre, music, film, and video, which have campaigns exceeding 100, whereas other categories like journalism, food, and games have fewer than 30 campaigns. The mean would likely be too skewed in this situation to provide an accurate overview. Using the median can give us a more representative measure of the typical number of backers across all categories, as it is less sensitive to extreme values and category differences.

**Use your data to determine if there is more variability with successful or unsuccessful campaigns. Does this make sense? Why or why not?**

Successful campaigns in this sheet show more differences in the number of backers than unsuccessful ones, they have a higher variance and standard deviation which shows more variability. To me this makes sense because different factors affect successful campaigns, like project quality, marketing, and social networks. These factors can vary a lot, leading to a wider range of backers. So, successful campaigns have more variability. On the other hand, we also know that unsuccessful campaigns often share similar problems, like poor marketing, weak social networks, bad rewards, or low-quality projects. These issues are more consistent, making the number of backers more similar and less variable in this group.