* Given the provided data, what are three conclusions that we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?
  1. More campaigns were successful than failed, except for food and games. The average success rate for all the categories was 50.9%. Journalism only had 4 campaigns, but all 4 were successful so they were the outlier with 100% success rate.
  2. Most of the campaigns were in the theater category, and they had the most successful campaigns based on their high count, but only 54.7% of their campaigns were successful.
  3. Plays had the most crowdfunding campaigns and were the most successful based on the high number of successful campaigns, but their success rate was 54.4% so almost half failed.
* What are some limitations of this dataset?
  1. Possible data imbalances as there were far more data for the theater category than any other category, and there were only 4 data points for journalism.
  2. We do not know how this data was collected so there could be bias in the collection methods.
  3. I noticed that the currency was from different countries so does that mean that this data was collected over different geographical areas which could indicate differences in general interest which could create a bias or an overgeneralization.
* What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?
  1. I created a table that simply gave the values for successful and failed campaigns per parent category so I could see the success and fail rate based on category. This showed me the average success rate was about 50% for this type of campaign funding.
  2. It would have been interesting to create a table to see what countries each of these campaigns were funded through to see if there were differences in the success rate based on country or if there were differences in the general interests of the population based on where the funding was allocated.

**Questions regarding successful and failed campaign bakers:**

* Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median better summarizes the data.
  1. I would say that the mean better summarizes the data as there was high variability in the data. If we do not account for the outliers, then the mean would not be inclusive of all data points. When dealing with monetary data, I would say that it is important to include all data points which is why I am saying the mean summarizes better. The median can be a better indicator of the central tendency, but the mean, in this case, better summarizes the data.
* Use your data to determine if there is more variability with successful or unsuccessful campaigns. Does this make sense? Why or why not?
  1. There is more variability in the successful campaign. This does not really make sense to me. I am assuming this could be because there was more variety in the amounts donated. Maybe the successful campaign had a more diverse base of supporters who donated differently based on their financial abilities. It would be the same with a failed campaign as well, but the ones who made it, likely had more supporter from different backgrounds and abilities to donate.