Below is the summary statistics table based on number of backers for successful and unsuccessful campaigns.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **successful** | **unsuccessful** |
| **Mean** | 851.1469 | 585.615385 |
| **Median** | 201 | 114.5 |
| **Min** | 16 | 0 |
| **Max** | 7295 | 6080 |
| **Variance** | 1603374 | 921574.682 |
| **Standard Dev.** | 1266.244 | 959.986813 |
| **Quartile1** | 128 | 38 |
| **Quartile2** | 201 | 114.5 |
| **Quartile3** | 1280 | 784.5 |
| **Quartile4** | 7295 | 6080 |

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

Key factors to note on checking what summarizes the data is uniform distribution of data. If data is normally distributed, the mean and median should be approx. similar which is not in this case from the above table. The mean in both cases is high which indicates the data is skewed.

So, in this case, the median better summarizes the data.

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

From the summary table, we can notice a higher variance and standard deviation for successful than unsuccessful campaigns. This indicates successful campaigns have more variability in the umber of backers than unsuccessful campaigns.

This makes sense because, backers most of the times prefer to be with successful campaigns and contribute