* Given the provided data, what are three conclusions that we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?
  + The theater category had the most enterprises and the most successful enterprises. Music and film & video came next, with film & video just beating out music.
  + I would conclude from the first chart that crowdfunding has at least an 50% success rate, depending on the category the crowdfunding falls into.
  + Plays skews the data. I had to delete it to really understand.
  + Rock music has the most enterprises, much more than any of the other music ventures. Chart 2
  + There is a sharp fall in the summer months in successful ventures, but it is followed by a smaller decrease in failed ventures the next month. Successful ventures do not make it back to their July numbers but they do increase to just below pre-summer (May). There is a big push of crowd funded projects in the early part of the year, near March. The largest increase in successful businesses begins in May and lasts through July, with a large downturn in August. Numbers do not reach pre-May number again in the year.
* What are some limitations of this dataset?
  + There are 3 times as much data collected from the USA than there are from any other country represented. The average number of enterprises tracked from the 6 other countries is just under 40 and the USA’s total number of enterprises tracked is 763. Including the US data points will cause the data to be skewed based on US preferences, which may not be replicated in other countries around the world.
* What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?
  + Splitting up the data based on comparable sized economies would have been helpful to see which categories did better compared to the size of the economy it was started in. The US has a current GDP of 23.32 trillion USD ([source.](https://www.google.com/search?rlz=1C1UEAD_enUS1038US1038&sxsrf=APwXEdd-8IZh8sXFJnd95Dzil7el5yP9zQ:1686002676780&q=US+GDP&spell=1&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjS8461ka3_AhW9nWoFHcGMBZgQBSgAegQIChAB&biw=2560&bih=1289&dpr=1)) while Great Britain is currently at only 3.13 trillion ([source.](https://www.google.com/search?q=Great+Britain+GDP&rlz=1C1UEAD_enUS1038US1038&oq=Great+Britain+GDP&aqs=chrome..69i57.6278j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8)). The US also has a much larger population than most of the other countries in the study. This could definitely effect the number of people available to fund a crowdsourced product.
  + The way the chart that looks at the months could be done differently. I would have rather seen all of the years on the X axis and been able to select the month for each year. This would have helped me understand the trends of each year compared to one another rather than the months. If you separate the data for each year and look at that chart, the outcomes are vastly different each year.
* Use your data to determine whether the mean or the median better summarizes the data.
  + The median better summarizes the data because the number of backers varies wildly with the successful enterprises. There are many that have fewer than 100 backers and some with over 7,000 backers. This causes the mean to be very skewed to the larger size, when more than half of the enterprises had truly less than 200 backers.
* Use your data to determine if there is more variability with successful or unsuccessful campaigns. Does this make sense? Why or why not?
  + There is more variability in successful campaigns because the standard deviation is larger. This means that the data sets are more spread out and therefor, vary more and are less predictable. This makes sense to me because the number of backers for the successful campaign varied a lot, more so than the failed campaigns.