1. Given the provided data, what are three conclusions that we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?
   1. We can say that out of all the data we have, without looking at different categories, that crowdfunding campaigns have a little higher than a 50% of being successful.
   2. We can say that plays have a lot more crowdfunding campaigns, with 344 campaigns out of the 1000 in our data.
   3. Setting a goal too low or too high can impact if you are successful or not. The campaigns that had a goal of 15,000 to 35,000 had much fewer failed campaigns. Although there were fewer overall campaigns with these goals, they had a much higher success rate.
   4. Lastly, we can say that most crowdfunding campaigns have a goal of under 10,000 or over 50,000. 499 campaigns had a goal of below 10,000 or above 50,000, while only 66 campaigns had a goal between 10,000 and 50,000.
2. What are some limitations of this dataset?
   1. I would say one limitation is not knowing why campaigns were canceled. This could give us some more interesting data to help us to make different decisions. Next, I would say that the data is a little skewed for plays. There were a lot more plays than any other category. Out of the 1000 campaigns we had, a play was 344 of the campaigns. Lastly, we don’t have anything to compare the data too. I have never been involved with a crowdfunding campaign, so I am not sure how often they are successful, or what the success rate for an average campaign is, so I cannot tell you if the data we have is good or if it is poor.
3. What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?
   1. I think we could have a graph for successes/failures per year. This will show us if there are any years where we underperformed or overperformed. We could then look at those years to figure out what we did right/wrong, that way we could continue doing what we were doing or fix a mistake that we were making. Another graph we could have is a graph that shows the length of a show or act and whether it was successful or not. This would give us an idea if the length of a show had any impact on the successfulness of the campaign. For instance, do shows that are open for 2-3 weeks have a better chance at being successful then a show that is only open for a few days?

Statistical analysis questions: (Answers are also in Excel workbook on ‘Statistical Analysis’ page.)

* I would say that the mean best describes the data. There are a lot of data points that are above 1000, so I don’t think saying the median describes the data well is accurate. For both data sets, I believe the mean gives you a better idea of the data.
* I would say there is more variability with successful campaigns. The standard deviation and variance are higher, which means more of the data is further away from the mean. This means that it has more variability. I think it does make sense because if the campaign is successful then the amount raised just must be more than the goal, which you can beat the goal by a long shot, making the data have more variability.