**Summary Table Report**

It is my belief that the median better summarizes this data because of the big standard deviation. With the maxes being 7295 and 6080 respectively, and then standard deviations being 1267 and 962 respectively, I believe that shows that there are quite a few large outliers and that much of the data does not surround the means closely. So the medians would give us a better representation of what the data is conveying.

There is more variability with successful campaigns which is shown in the data by both the variance and standard deviation being higher than those of the failed campaigns. I believe that this does make sense, because there is no limit as to how far over the goal a successful campaign can go, so the successful campaigns will naturally have some overachievers in which there are tons and tons of people who contributed. There also is the chance with successful campaigns that there is just one large backer who contributed all the money needed to reach the goal. Then with failed campaigns there most likely won’t be a huge outlier on the upper end of backers because if there that campaign would most likely have been successful. So since there is more or less of an upper limit with failed campaigns, and there is not any true limits with successful campaigns, it would make sense that successful campaigns would have more variability.