Homework Module 1

1. Given the provided data the conclusions made about crowdfunding are as follows:
   1. They are mostly successful. More than 56% of the campaigns were successful in reaching the goal, with almost 30% of them more than doubling it.
   2. Crowdfunding is a means to acquire contributions from all over the world, not just locally. While the 7 countries all had different levels of involvement (with the US accounting for more than 76% of all contributions), each country had roughly the same percentage of success, ranging from 50-58% of all campaigns per country reaching at least 100% their goal.
   3. In all countries, plays were the most universally prolific category, indicating patrons of the arts, globally, are most likely to invest in crowdfunding campaigns.
2. Limitations of this data set include:
   1. It is not clear exactly how to ascertain information about the backers that participated in the campaign. The backers’ count does not indicate what the qualifiers are. Are members of the same family considered one backer, or are they counted separately? Do the backers work for the company? Are they investors? Friends? Family? What’s the age and income level of each backer? Knowing exactly who is funding each campaign will help assess how to reach more people to invest in future fundraising.
   2. How the money was contributed is also not clear. Did they write a check? Did they use an online payment program via credit card or linked bank account? Did the companies offer a tax-deduction incentive? Understanding how people give money is relevant.
   3. Knowing how/why a company failed to meet its goal is extremely important, and this data set does not give us information needed to make any kind of assumptions about what needs to be corrected in terms of going forward.
   4. The correlation between the blurb and the parent/sub-categories is unbeknownst to someone just looking at the data. The relevance of the blurb seems like it would be something worth understanding. But, without any context, as presented here, it seems rather random and unusable
   5. The data lacks insight as to how each goal was calculated.
   6. The data does not indicate for what purpose the funding has or if it’s legal, thus creating a liability exposure to the donors.
   7. It is impossible to tell from the data the size of each company. If “company A” has 10k employees and “company B” has 15, and they each raised the same amount of money, it would seem that “company B” raised a larger share of capital.

1. Other possible tables/graphs we could use to further explore include:
   1. A breakdown of the outcome statistics for each country. I have already included this as I felt it relevant for an overview analysis. In response to questions 1, I included data I got from the sheet titled “Percentage by Country Outcome”.
   2. A sortable sheet that shows how each country and each company from each country compared against each other and how it all stacks together. This would show us a clearer picture of how all the contributions fared against one another within their country and how that contributed to the final success of the entire project. It would be interesting to see the variances in numbers that caused some to under pledge and some to possibly have set their goal too high or too low. For example:
      1. The entire Crowdfunding had a goal of 1 million.
      2. Country “A” had a cumulative goal of 100,000 and pledged 100,000.
         1. Their goal was 10% of the total project goal.
         2. They pledged 100% of their goal.
         3. They pledged 10% of the total project goal.
      3. Within Country “A”, *Company B* had a goal of 10,000 and pledged 9,000
         1. Their goal was 10% of the Country “A” total goal
         2. Their goal was 1% of the total project goal.
         3. They pledged 90% of their goal.
         4. They pledged 9% of the country’s goal.
         5. They pledged .9% of the total goal.

Statistical Analysis

After calculating the statistics, I realized that the standard deviation for both successful and unsuccessful backers were both quite large, so it wasn’t extremely useful in this case. However, the number of backers contributing to a campaign that was successful was about 130% more than the number that contributed to a failed campaign. The average donation across the board was $68 per backer. That number varied very little between successful and failed; With successful companies averaging $69 per backer, and failed companies averaging $64 per backer. Those too failed to in offering much insight into what caused some to fail while others were successful. What did show large discrepancies, were the mean and the mode of the number of backers per company. Successful campaigns had a mean of 851 with a mode of 85. Failed campaigns had a mean of 586 and a mode of 1. These numbers indicate that the success of the campaign was directly related, quite simply, to the number of backers each company got to contribute.