# Kickstarter Crowdfunding: How the Predictors of Success Vary by Project

# Category

Salvador Briggman

tkb@gwmail.gwu.edu

Economics 4198W

12/12/12

#### I. Introduction:

The Web 2.0 term "crowdfunding" refers to the process by which an individual with an investment opportunity or project idea can raise money to support this endeavor from many different backers via the internet. In return for pledging funds, these backers can receive a variety of rewards, often of modest value, ranging from product pre-orders to production credits. Crowdfunding backers do not receive any form of legal ownership in return for pledging their funds for a designated project (equity crowdfunding websites are currently illegal in the United States). Many backers are first or second degree relations of the individual but often they are complete strangers.

The concept of crowdfunding via the internet was first implemented in the year 2000 and has since been growing rapidly all over the world. According to an industry report gathered by Crowdsourcing.org from 52 crowdfunding platforms worldwide, the estimated total crowdfunding volume will double by the end of 2012 to \$2.8 billion. This leads to a crowdfunding platform growth rate of 48.8% since 2007. Despite the growing use of this new method of project financing, few scholarly articles have studied the mechanism and almost none have estimated the factors that determine whether or not the proposed project is successfully funded. Obvious candidate variables include the rewards offered to backers, the fundraising goal, the duration of the project, the size of the project owner's social network, and more.

Professor Mollick of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania is one of the authorities in this field, having examined data from Kickstarter.com to try to help answer these questions regarding variables that contribute to the success or failure of fundraising campaigns. In this paper, I will be extending his analysis by examining how the variables affecting project-funding success on Kickstarter vary from category to category. These categories include: Art, Comics, Dance Design, Fashion, Film & Video, Food, Games, Music, Photography, Publishing, Technology and Theater.

#### II. Background:

Kickstarter.com was launched in April of 2009 and serves as a platform for individuals to raise small donations from "crowds" in order to finance creative and technological projects. The company has raised over \$10 million in funding from backers such as the NYC venture firm Union Square Ventures and angel investors including Jack Dorsey, the founder of Twitter. As a project owner, you must specify the duration that the proposed project will be open for donations and designate a monetary fundraising goal. If the fundraising goal is met, then the owner is under legal obligation to complete their project and distribute any promised rewards. If the fundraising goal is not met by the duration set, then the creator is not entitled to the funds raised and is under obligation to refund the backers. Kickstarter.com does not take responsibility for refunds. If the fundraising goal is met or exceeded, then the owner receives the full amount pledged after Kickstarter's standard fee of 4%.

Before I dive into my data and empirical model, I'd like to give some context on the crowdfunding industry as a whole and why this study is relevant. In the study, "Crowdfunding Industry Report Market Trends, Composition and Crowdfunding Platforms" conducted by crowdfunding.org, \$1.5 billion was raised by crowdfunding platforms worldwide and an estimated \$2.8 billion dollars will be pledged worldwide in 2012, with the majority of growth coming from equity-based crowdfunding. This is an overall compounded annual growth rate of 63% over the last 3 years. In 2011, rewardbased crowdfunding grew at a rate of 79%, while donation based grew at 41%. The fastest growing category of crowdfunding is equity-based which grew at 114%. When looking at donation or reward-based projects, the majority fundraising amount was less than \$5,000. On Kickstarter.com alone, \$404 million has been pledged since 2009 with 11 projects reaching the \$1 million funding mark. Clearly, this is a rapidly developing industry that will play an important role in producing new innovations.

#### **III.** Literature Review

Professor Mollick, of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania conducted a scholarly analysis of Kickstarter in his study, "The Dynamics of Crowdfunding: Determinants of Success and Failure." In this report, Mollick examined data from Kickstarter to better determine what makes a crowdfunded project successful. He took into account the following factors for Kickstarter projects: geography, number of facebook friends of founders, number of tiers of rewards advertised, number of comments, number of updates given by founders, duration of project fundraising campaign, fundraising goal, percentage of goal funded, the number of backers, percentage of first time backers, and finally pledge per backer.

Mollick's study was focused on the variables that affect the success of Kickstarter projects overall. He found that 47.90% of proposed projects were successful and that the average project goal was \$9,755. In addition, he found that the average pledge per backer was \$64.04 and the average number of backers was 57.90. Kickstarter.com itself reports

the number of successful projects at 46%, the average goal as \$5,000, the average pledge as \$71 and the average number of backers as 85.

Mollick also determined that the "mean amount funded of failed projects is 10.3% of the goal. Only ten percent of projects that fail raise 30% of their goal, and only three percent raise 50% of their goal." This data shows that projects generally will fail to reach their funding goal by a large margin. In addition, he found that "Twenty five percent of projects that are funded are 3% or less over their goal, and only fifty percent are about 10% over their goal. Only about 1 project in 9 receives 200% of its goal." This shows that projects generally will succeed by a small margin. Finally, overall, he determined that increasing fundraising goal level is negatively associated with success. Being featured on the front page of the website is strongly associated with success. "An unfeatured project has a 30% chance of success, while a featured project has an 89% chance." Longer durations decrease the chances of success. "A 30 day duration project has a 35% chance of success, while a 60 day project has a 29% chance."

It has been widely reported that gaming, music and film are the more successful categories on Kickstarter in terms of dollars raised, where as categories like photography and comics are less successful in aggregate funding. However, categories that have low amounts of total pledged dollars like dance can have high success rates (70 %). The weight given to the variables affecting success could vary from category to category.

#### **IV.** Hypothesis and Test

Mollick's analysis is centered on the variables that affect success for an average Kickstarter project. I will further his study by focusing more on how the weight given to the variables that affect project success vary from category to category. This could yield important information for Kickstarter project owners when both deciding which category to place their project and on which elements to focus. Once I establish the regression I will use the odds estimate ratios to test my predictions.

Statistical Hypothesis: Null =  $\beta = 0$ , Alt =  $\beta \neq 0$ y=  $\alpha + \beta_1$  Goal +  $\beta_2$  Pledged +  $\beta_3$  Fper +  $\beta_4$  Backers +  $\beta_5$  Levels +  $\beta_6$  Updates +  $\beta_7$ Comments +  $\beta_8$  Duration

#### V. Data and Empirical Model

I will be using a data set comprised of 45,815 projects from 5/3/2009 until 8/1/2012 that have been gathered using a PHP scraper script. These projects have the following attributes: category, status (live/not live), outcome (success/failure meeting goal), fundraising goal, dollars pledged, funded percentage, number of backers, number of reward levels, number of comments, number of updates, duration of project fundraising campaign, and date funded. I scrubbed this data set by separating projects by category, removing outliers, and deleting projects that are "live" and therefore are still gathering pledges.

I will conduct a multiple logistic regression for each Kickstarter category to determine the effects of the variables gathered on the dependent variable of whether or not the project was successful, meaning that the fundraising goal was met. I will then compare these categories to determine whether certain independent variables have more effect on the dependent variable in one category than in others. The regression failure will categorically be represented by 0 and the regression success will be categorically represented by 1. The results with a lower AIC and SC show a better fit to the model.

This would lead to less error statistically in those categories. See appendix for logistical

regression results.

# VI. Results

Logistic Regre	ssion Odds Ratio	Estimate Co	mparison					
Category	Goal	Pledged	Funded Percentage	Backers	Levels	Updates	Comments	Duration
Art	0.997	1.003	1.037	1.038	1.01	1.017	1.003	1.003
Comic	0.999	1.001	1.112	0.999	0.928	1.109	0.953	1.002
Dance	0.998	1.001	1.298	1.042	0.83	1.872	0.96	0.984
Design	1	1	1.144	1.001	0.923	1.189	0.97	1.004
Fashion	0.999	1.001	1.203	0.994	1.102	1.085	1.091	1.002
Film	0.999	1.001	1.096	1.014	0.945	1.012	0.978	1
Food	1	1	1.356	1.005	1.053	1.019	1.015	0.955
Games	1	1	1.351	0.997	1.049	0.984	1.002	0.995
Music	0.997	1.003	1.336	0.998	0.958	1.032	1.149	0.985
Photography	1	1	1.584	0.985	1.216	1.048	1.271	0.972
Publishing	0.999	1.001	1.229	1.014	0.964	0.988	1.071	0.991
Technology	1	1	1.538	1.002	0.953	1.137	1.009	0.995
Theater	0.999	1.001	1.224	0.995	1.261	1.043	0.983	1.025
	Negative effect	on odds						
	Positive effect of	n odds						
	No effect on od	ds						

# Table 1

# Table 2

Relative Effect on Odds of Fundraising Success									
Category	Goal	Pledged	Funded Percentage	Backers	Levels	Updates	Comments	Duration	
Art	0.997	1.003	1.037	1.038	1.01	1.017	1.003	1.003	
Comic	0.999	1.001	1.112	0.999	0.928	1.109	0.953	1.002	
Dance	0.998		1.298	1.042	0.83	1.872	0.96	0.984	
Design	1	1	1.144	1.001	0.923	1.189	0.97	1.004	
Fashion	0.999	1.001	1.203	0.994	1.102	1.085	1.091	1.002	
Film	0.999	1.001	1.096	1.014	0.945	1.012	0.978	1	
Food	1	1	1.356	1.005	1.053	1.019	1.015	0.955	
Games	1	1	1.351	0.997	1.049	0.984	1.002	0.995	
Music	0.997	1.003	1.336	0.998	0.958	1.032	1.149	0.985	
Photography	1	1	1.584	0.985	1.216	1.048	1.271	0.972	
Publishing	0.999	1.001	1.229	1.014	0.964	0.988	1.071	0.991	
Technology	1	1	1.538	1.002	0.953	1.137	1.009	0.995	
Theater	0.999	1.001	1.224	0.995	1.261	1.043	0.983	1.025	
Positive		Negative		Neutral					
	low		low						
	medium		medium						
	high		high						

#### Table 3

95% Wal	d Confider	ce Limits															
Category	Goal LL	Goal UL	Pledged LL	Pledged UL	FP LL	FP UL	Backers L	Backers U	Levels LL	Levels UL	Updates L	Updates UL	Comments L	Comments UL	Duration LI	Duration U	L
Art	0.997	0.998	1.002	1.004	1.026	1.047	1.011	1.066	0.939	1.086	0.944	1.094	0.891	1.13	0.989	1.018	
Comic	0.997	0.998	1.002	1.004	1.026	1.047	1.011	1.066	0.939	1.086	0.944	1.094	0.891	1.13	0.989	1.018	
Dance	0.99	1.007	0.993	1.01	0.796	2.117	0.928	1.17	0.389	1.772	0.543	6.449	0.428	2.156	0.888	1.091	
Design	0.999	1	1	1.001	1.087	1.205	0.984	1.018	0.735	1.159	0.931	1.518	0.896	1.049	0.959	1.052	
Fashion	0.996	1.002	0.998	1.005	1.06	1.364	0.911	1.084	0.68	1.787	0.702	1.676	0.647	1.839	0.924	1.085	
Film	0.999	1	1	1.001	1.085	1.107	1.003	1.025	0.892	1.001	0.968	1.057	0.918	1.041	0.989	1.012	
Food	0.998	1.002	0.998	1.002	1.073	1.713	0.962	1.049	0.527	2.102	0.701	1.483	0.727	1.417	0.851	1.072	
Games	1	1	1	1.001	1.157	1.578	0.978	1.016	0.52	2.117	0.707	1.369	0.948	1.061	0.851	1.164	
Music	0.994	1.001	0.999	1.006	1.188	1.502	0.963	1.034	0.793	1.157	0.868	1.226	0.77	1.713	0.945	1.027	
Photograp	0.994	1.006	0.994	1.006	0.983	2.551	0.901	1.077	0.287	5.151	0.442	2.485	0.203	7.964	0.86	1.1	
Publishing	0.997	1	0.999	1.003	1.133	1.334	0.984	1.045	0.782	1.188	0.901	1.085	0.782	1.467	0.944	1.04	
Technolog	1	1	0.999	1.001	1.038	2.279	0.913	1.1	0.299	3.041	0.313	4.126	0.688	1.479	0.83	1.194	
Theater	0.996	1.002	0.998	1.004	1.11	1.35	0.955	1.037	0.926	1.719	0.813	1.337	0.704	1.372	0.971	1.082	

#### VII. Discussion of Results

I reject the null hypothesis and conclude that beta does not equal zero. Since at least one beta does not equal zero, I reject the null at an alpha of .05, which allows me to use the odd ratio estimate for the analysis.

For the fundraising goal variable, overall the results showed that for each dollar increase in the fundraising goal, the odds of fundraising success decreased from between .1% to .3%. The only categories where the goal variable had no effect on odds was design, food, games, photography, and technology.

For the dollars pledged variable, overall, the results showed that for each dollar increase in the dollars pledge, the odds of fundraising success increased from between .1% to .3%. The categories of music and art showed the most increase in odds and the categories of design, food, games, photography, and technology showed no effect.

For the number of backers variable, overall, the results were mixed. For the categories of art, dance, design, film, food, publishing, and technology an increase in the number of backers had a positive effect on the odds of fundraising success varying between .1% and 4%. An increase in the number of backers had the most positive effect on the odds of success for the categories of dance and art. It has the least positive effect

on the categories of design and technology. For the categories of comics, fashion, games, music, photography, and theater, an increase in the number of backers had a negative effect on the odds of success varying from .1% to 1.5%. Photography stood out as category where an increase in the number of backers caused a larger relative negative effect on the odds of fundraising success.

For the number of reward levels variable, the results were also mixed. For the categories of art, fashion, food, games, photography, and theater an increase in the number of reward levels had a positive effect on the odds of fundraising success varying between .1% and 21.6%. An increase in the number of reward levels had the most effect on the categories of photography, theater, and fashion by a far larger margin than other categories. This leads to the conclusion that for the Kickstarter categories of photography, theater, and fashion by a far larger margin than other categories. This leads to the conclusion that for the Kickstarter categories of photography, theater, and fashion, special attention should be paid for the number of reward levels that project owners create to incentivize their backers. An increase in the number of reward levels had a negative effect on the rest of the categories in terms of the odds of fundraising success varying from 3.6% to 17%. Dance, comics, and design should be noted as categories where an increase in the number of rewards levels caused a larger relative effect on the odds of fundraising success.

For the number of updates variable, the results were relatively uniform. Except for the games and publishing category, an increase in the number of updates had a positive effect on the odds of fundraising success varying between 1.7% to 87%. For the dance, comics, design, and technologies categories, an increase in the number of updates had a significantly larger effect on the odds of fundraising success compared to the other categories. This was especially true for the dance category. An increase in the number of updates had a negative effect on the rest of the categories in terms of odds of fundraising success varying from 1.2% to 1.6%.

For the number of comments variable, an increase in the number of comments had a negative effect on the odds of fundraising success for the comics, dance, design, film, and theater categories varying from 1.7% to 4.7%. The other categories experienced a positive effect on the odds of fundraising success ranging from .2% to 27.1%. Notably, an increase in the number of comments had a relatively high positive effect on the odds of success for the photography and music categories. It has a relatively medium positive effect for the fashion and publishing categories and a relatively low positive effect for the remaining categories.

Lastly, for the duration of the project, the results were mixed. An increase in the duration of the project had a positive effect on the odds of fundraising success for the categories of theater, art, comics, design, and fashion varying from .2% to 2.5%. This effect was essentially of the same weight across the board except for the theater category, where an increase in project duration had a relatively strong effect on the odds of fundraising success. For the rest of the categories, an increase in the duration of the project had a negative effect on the odds of fundraising success ranging from .5% to 4.5% except for the film category, which experienced no effects. It should be noted that an increase in the duration of the project had a strong relative negative effect on the odds of success for the food category.

#### VIII. Conclusion

From the results, it can be concluded that the weight given to the variables impacting fundraising success vary from category to category. However, not all variables had the same level of variation. Number of backers, number of levels, number of updates, number of comments, and project duration had the most variation.

Overall, for a one-unit increase in the number of backers in the categories of art and dance, there are stronger relative positive effects on the probability of fundraising success than for the rest of the categories and for a one-unit increase in the category of photography, there is a stronger relative negative effect.

For a one-unit increase in the number of reward levels in the categories of fashion, photography, and theater, there are stronger relative positive effects on the probability of success than the rest of categories and for a one-unit increase in the category of dance, there is a stronger relative negative effect.

For a one-unit increase in the number of updates by the project creator in the categories of dance and design, there are stronger relative positive effects on the probability of success than the rest of categories.

For a one-unit increase in the number of comments on the project in the categories of music and photography, there are stronger relative positive effects on the probability of success than the rest of categories and for a one-unit increase in the category of comics, there is a stronger relative negative effect.

For a one-unit increase in the duration of the project in the category of food, there is a stronger relative positive effect on the probability of success than the rest of categories. Strangely, the category of dance had results that seem to vary from the norm for almost every variable except number of comments and the duration of the project. Even for those two variables, dance displayed moderate deviation from the norm. Should Kickstarter project owners decide to start a dance fundraising campaign, they should take these results into consideration, as the general guidelines established by Professor Mollick will not apply for this category. Otherwise, project owners will be less likely to conduct a successful fundraising campaign. Project creators should also take this study's results into account when they create a campaign in any of the above listed categories, as the weight given to variables that affect success will deviate from Mollick's findings.

Lastly, although several of these independent variables such as the number of backers and comments are out of the hands of project creators, many, like the duration of the project and number of updates or reward levels can be altered in order to improve the odds of fundraising success. Since the variables in this study have different impacts depending on the project category, this information can help project owners when they are deciding which category to list their project on Kickstarter. This information holds enormous financial value. A great example is the famous Pebble: E-Paper Watch, which raised \$10 M on Kickstarter. The owners decided to place this project in the design category, instead of the technology category, due to anticipation of better reception. Now, by utilizing the results of this study, project owners can help improve the odds of fundraising success and get a better idea of which project elements to focus on and to what degree, which varies from category to category.

Further study is required regarding the emerging crowdfunding industry. Recently, niche platforms have sprung into existence covering music, publishing, and many of the categories that exist on Kickstarter. Is it more beneficial for project owners to post their proposed project on Kickstarter or one of these niche sites? How does the weight given to variables affecting fundraising success change from platform to platform? In addition, when equity crowdfunding is legalized towards the end of 2013 after the SEC has finished crafting regulations, studies will need to be conducted to investigate these equity crowdfunding portals and how their activity differs from project crowdfunding platforms. The weight given to the variables affecting success may be completely different. Clearly, there is ample opportunity for further scholarly study of this new financial instrument.

#### Works Cited

- Crowdfunding Industry Report Market Trends, Composition and Crowdfunding Platforms. N.p.: Crowdsourcing.org, 2012. Print.
- Knaup, Amy E. Survival and Longevity in the Business Employment Dynamics Data. N.p.: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2005. Print.
- Kooi, Michael, comp. Venture Impact: The Economic Importance of Venture Backed Companies to the U.S. Economy. Research rept. N.p.: National Venture Capital Association, 2011.
  Print.
- Phillips, Bruce D., and Bruce A. Kirchhoff. Formation, Growth and Survival; Small Firm Dynamics in the U.S. Economy. N.p.: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989. Print. Small Business Economics 1.
- Securities and Exchange Commission. *Crowdfunding and the Federal Securities Law*. By Steven Bradford. N.p.: n.p., 2011. Print.
- Shane, Scott. Illusions of Entrepreneurship: The Costly Myths that Entrepreneurs, Investors, and Policy Makers Live By. N.p.: Yale University Press, 2010. Print.

# Appendix

	Art					
	The LOGISTIC Procedure					
	Model Information					
Data Set	c:\users\ias1120\Documents\My Sas Files\9.3\artfpperc.sas7bdat					
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status				
Number of Response Levels	2					
Model	binary logit					
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring					

Number of Observations Read 3684

Number of Observations Used 3684

<b>Response Profile</b>					
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency			
1	1	2102			
2	0	1582			

Probability modeled is status=1.

# **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

# Warning: The LOGISTIC procedure continues in spite of the above warning. Results shown are based on the last maximum likelihood iteration. Validity of the model fit is questionable.

<b>Model Fit Statistics</b>					
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates			
AIC	5035.464	215.991			
SC	5041.676	271.897			
-2 Log L	5033.464	197.991			

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0						
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq			
Likelihood Ratio	4835.4733	8	<.0001			
Score	860.0426	8	<.0001			
Wald	434.8080	8	<.0001			

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-2.3920	0.5128	21.7563	<.0001
goal	1	-0.00266	0.000399	44.4401	<.0001
pledged	1	0.00288	0.000446	41.8225	<.0001
fper	1	0.0360	0.00513	49.1548	<.0001
backers	1	0.0373	0.0133	7.8151	0.0052
levels	1	0.00973	0.0370	0.0691	0.7926
updates	1	0.0164	0.0377	0.1901	0.6629
comments	1	0.00335	0.0604	0.0031	0.9558
duration	1	0.00332	0.00756	0.1924	0.6609

#### **Odds Ratio Estimates**

Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits
goal	0.997	0.997 0.998
pledged	1.003	1.002 1.004
fper	1.037	1.026 1.047
backers	1.038	1.011 1.066
levels	1.010	0.939 1.086
updates	1.017	0.944 1.094
comments	1.003	0.891 1.130
duration	1.003	0.989 1.018

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses						
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000			
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000			
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.490			
Pairs	3325364	c	1.000			

	Comics	
	The LOGISTIC Procedure	
	Model Information	
Data Set	c:\users\ias1120\Documents\My Sas Files\9.3\comicsperc.sas7bdat	
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status
Number of Response Levels	2	
Model	binary logit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Number of Observations Used 3684

<b>Response Profile</b>					
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency			
1	1	2102			
2	0	1582			

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

Warning: The LOGISTIC procedure continues in spite of the above warning. Results shown are based on the last maximum likelihood iteration. Validity of the model fit is questionable.

Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	5035.464	215.991
SC	5041.676	271.897
-2 Log L	5033.464	197.991

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0				
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq	
Likelihood Ratio	4835.4733	8	<.0001	
Score	860.0426	8	<.0001	
Wald	434.8080	8	<.0001	

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-2.3920	0.5128	21.7563	<.0001
goal	1	-0.00266	0.000399	44.4401	<.0001
pledged	1	0.00288	0.000446	41.8225	<.0001
fper	1	0.0360	0.00513	49.1548	<.0001
backers	1	0.0373	0.0133	7.8151	0.0052
levels	1	0.00973	0.0370	0.0691	0.7926
updates	1	0.0164	0.0377	0.1901	0.6629
comments	1	0.00335	0.0604	0.0031	0.9558
duration	1	0.00332	0.00756	0.1924	0.6609

	<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits			
goal	0.997	0.997 0.998			
pledged	1.003	1.002 1.004			

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wa Confidence	ld Limits	
fper	1.037	1.026	1.047	
backers	1.038	1.011	1.066	
levels	1.010	0.939	1.086	
updates	1.017	0.944	1.094	
comments	1.003	0.891	1.130	
duration	1.003	0.989	1.018	

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.490
Pairs	3325364	c	1.000

	Dance			
	The LOGISTIC Procedure			
	<b>Model Information</b>			
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\dancelogistic.sas7bdat			
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status		
Number of Response Levels	2			
Model	binary logit			
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring			

Number of Observations Used 704

<b>Response Profile</b>				
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency		
1	1	525		
2	0	179		

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

Warning: The LOGISTIC procedure continues in spite of the above warning. Results shown are based on the last maximum likelihood iteration. Validity of the model fit is questionable.

Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	800.292	24.665
SC	804.848	65.676
-2 Log L	798.292	6.665

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0				
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq	
Likelihood Ratio	791.6268	8	<.0001	
Score	186.8628	8	<.0001	
Wald	8.6295	8	0.3745	

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-20.3891	25.1730	0.6560	0.4180
goal	1	-0.00161	0.00422	0.1456	0.7028
pledged	1	0.00118	0.00425	0.0778	0.7803
fper	1	0.2610	0.2495	1.0939	0.2956
backers	1	0.0412	0.0591	0.4856	0.4859
levels	1	-0.1865	0.3870	0.2322	0.6299
updates	1	0.6270	0.6311	0.9872	0.3204
comments	1	-0.0404	0.4127	0.0096	0.9220
duration	1	-0.0159	0.0527	0.0909	0.7630

	<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits			
goal	0.998	0.990 1.007			
pledged	1.001	0.993 1.010			

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% W Confidence	ald Limits
fper	1.298	0.796	2.117
backers	1.042	0.928	1.170
levels	0.830	0.389	1.772
updates	1.872	0.543	6.449
comments	0.960	0.428	2.156
duration	0.984	0.888	1.091

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.380
Pairs	93975	c	1.000

Design		
	The LOGISTIC Procedure	
	Model Information	
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\designlogistic.sas7bdat	
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status
Number of Response Levels	2	
Model	binary logit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Number of Observations Used 1561

<b>Response Profile</b>			
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency	
1	1	726	
2	0	835	

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

Warning: The LOGISTIC procedure continues in spite of the above warning. Results shown are based on the last maximum likelihood iteration. Validity of the model fit is questionable.

Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	2158.388	43.845
SC	2163.741	92.023
-2 Log L	2156.388	25.845

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0				
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq	
Likelihood Ratio	2130.5433	8	<.0001	
Score	539.9225	8	<.0001	
Wald	64.0565	8	<.0001	

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-10.6928	2.6713	16.0231	<.0001
goal	1	-0.00022	0.000337	0.4107	0.5216
pledged	1	0.000268	0.000375	0.5118	0.4744
fper	1	0.1349	0.0265	25.9456	<.0001
backers	1	0.000827	0.00876	0.0089	0.9247
levels	1	-0.0802	0.1161	0.4774	0.4896
updates	1	0.1728	0.1248	1.9172	0.1662
comments	1	-0.0306	0.0402	0.5772	0.4474
duration	1	0.00429	0.0235	0.0334	0.8550

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>			
Effect	<b>Point Estimate</b>	95% Wald Confidence Limit	ts
goal	1.000	0.999 1.00	0
pledged	1.000	1.000 1.00	1

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% W Confidence	'ald Limits
fper	1.144	1.087	1.205
backers	1.001	0.984	1.018
levels	0.923	0.735	1.159
updates	1.189	0.931	1.518
comments	0.970	0.896	1.049
duration	1.004	0.959	1.052

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.498
Pairs	606210	c	1.000

Fashion		
	The LOGISTIC Procedure	
	<b>Model Information</b>	
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\fashionlogistic.sas7bdat	
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status
Number of Response Levels	2	
Model	binary logit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Number of Observations Used 1018

<b>Response Profile</b>			
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency	
1	1	335	
2	0	683	

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

Warning: The LOGISTIC procedure continues in spite of the above warning. Results shown are based on the last maximum likelihood iteration. Validity of the model fit is questionable.

Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	1291.852	27.264
SC	1296.778	71.594
-2 Log L	1289.852	9.264

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0					
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq		
Likelihood Ratio	1280.5888	8	<.0001		
Score	349.2178	8	<.0001		
Wald	26.4368	8	0.0009		

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-16.1443	6.1151	6.9699	0.0083
goal	1	-0.00088	0.00141	0.3898	0.5324
pledged	1	0.00112	0.00175	0.4077	0.5231
fper	1	0.1845	0.0643	8.2335	0.0041
backers	1	-0.00629	0.0444	0.0201	0.8873
levels	1	0.0973	0.2465	0.1557	0.6931
updates	1	0.0814	0.2221	0.1342	0.7141
comments	1	0.0872	0.2664	0.1071	0.7435
duration	1	0.00153	0.0409	0.0014	0.9703

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>					
Effect	Effect Point Estimate 95% Wald Confidence Limi				
goal	0.999	0.996 1.002			
pledged	1.001	0.998 1.005			

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>					
Effect	Point Estimate	95% W Confidence	ald Limits		
fper	1.203	1.060	1.364		
backers	0.994	0.911	1.084		
levels	1.102	0.680	1.787		
updates	1.085	0.702	1.676		
comments	1.091	0.647	1.839		
duration	1.002	0.924	1.085		

# Association of Predicted Probabilities and<br/>Observed ResponsesPercent Concordant100.0Somers' D1.000Percent Discordant0.0Gamma1.000Percent Tied0.0Tau-a0.442Pairs228805c1.000

Film			
	The LOGISTIC Procedure		
	<b>Model Information</b>		
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\filmlogistic.sas7bdat		
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status	
Number of Response Levels	2		
Model	binary logit		
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring		

Number	of Observations Read	12550

<b>Response Profile</b>			
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency	
1	1	6400	
2	0	6150	

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

<b>Model Fit Statistics</b>					
Criterion Intercept Intercept Only and Covariates					
AIC	17395.014	318.129			
SC	17402.451	385.066			
-2 Log L	17393.014	300.129			

<b>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</b>					
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq		
Likelihood Ratio	17092.8852	8	<.0001		
Score	2890.1429	8	<.0001		
Wald	983.9633	8	<.0001		

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-5.7319	0.5066	128.0312	<.0001
goal	1	-0.00058	0.000112	27.3177	<.0001
pledged	1	0.000630	0.000126	24.7795	<.0001
fper	1	0.0920	0.00514	320.1327	<.0001
backers	1	0.0137	0.00562	5.9790	0.0145
levels	1	-0.0562	0.0294	3.6472	0.0562
updates	1	0.0115	0.0222	0.2670	0.6054
comments	1	-0.0228	0.0320	0.5063	0.4767
duration	1	0.000491	0.00608	0.0065	0.9356

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>					
Effect	Point Estimate	95% V Confidence	Vald e Limits		
goal	0.999	0.999	1.000		

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits		
pledged	1.001	1.000 1.001		
fper	1.096	1.085 1.107		
backers	1.014	1.003 1.025		
levels	0.945	0.892 1.001		
updates	1.012	0.968 1.057		
comments	0.978	0.918 1.041		
duration	1.000	0.989 1.012		

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses			
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.500
Pairs	39360000	c	1.000

Food			
	The LOGISTIC Procedure		
	<b>Model Information</b>		
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\foodlogistic.sas7bdat		
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status	
Number of Response Levels	2		
Model	binary logit		
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring		

Number of Observations Read				1291		
	_		-		-	

<b>Response Profile</b>			
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency	
1	1	652	
2	0	639	

Probability modeled is status=1.

# **Model Convergence Status**

Complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate does not exist.

<b>Model Fit Statistics</b>			
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates	
AIC	1791.575	21.530	
SC	1796.738	67.999	
-2 Log L	1789.575	3.530	

<b>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</b>				
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq	
Likelihood Ratio	1786.0448	8	<.0001	
Score	453.7552	8	<.0001	
Wald	19.3461	8	0.0131	

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-23.4513	10.5274	4.9624	0.0259
goal	1	-0.00026	0.00113	0.0533	0.8174
pledged	1	0.000176	0.00118	0.0224	0.8811
fper	1	0.3043	0.1195	6.4827	0.0109
backers	1	0.00457	0.0223	0.0421	0.8374
levels	1	0.0512	0.3530	0.0210	0.8847
updates	1	0.0192	0.1912	0.0101	0.9199
comments	1	0.0152	0.1702	0.0080	0.9287
duration	1	-0.0457	0.0589	0.6027	0.4376

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits		
goal	1.000	0.998 1.002		

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% W Confidence	ald Limits	
pledged	1.000	0.998	1.002	
fper	1.356	1.073	1.713	
backers	1.005	0.962	1.049	
levels	1.053	0.527	2.102	
updates	1.019	0.701	1.483	
comments	1.015	0.727	1.417	
duration	0.955	0.851	1.072	

# Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses

Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.500
Pairs	416628	c	1.000

Games		
	The LOGISTIC Procedure	
	<b>Model Information</b>	
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\gameslogistic.sas7bdat	
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status
Number of Response Levels	2	
Model	binary logit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Number of Observations Read	1460	
Number of Observations Used	1460	

<b>Response Profile</b>			
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency	
1	1	631	
2	0	829	

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate does not exist.

<b>Model Fit Statistics</b>				
Criterion	riterion Intercept Interce Only an Covariate			
AIC	1999.055	20.429		
SC	2004.341	68.005		
-2 Log L	1997.055	2.429		

<b>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</b>			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	1994.6257	8	<.0001
Score	599.5810	8	<.0001
Wald	14.9625	8	0.0599

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-25.6409	8.3318	9.4708	0.0021
goal	1	0.000015	0.000026	0.3231	0.5698
pledged	1	0.000046	0.000236	0.0381	0.8452
fper	1	0.3008	0.0792	14.4167	0.0001
backers	1	-0.00333	0.00959	0.1206	0.7284
levels	1	0.0482	0.3580	0.0181	0.8929
updates	1	-0.0160	0.1685	0.0090	0.9243
comments	1	0.00242	0.0287	0.0071	0.9329
duration	1	-0.00468	0.0799	0.0034	0.9533

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% W Confidence	ald Limits
goal	1.000	1.000	1.000

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limi		
pledged	1.000	1.000	1.001	
fper	1.351	1.157	1.578	
backers	0.997	0.978	1.016	
levels	1.049	0.520	2.117	
updates	0.984	0.707	1.369	
comments	1.002	0.948	1.061	
duration	0.995	0.851	1.164	

# Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses

Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.491
Pairs	523099	c	1.000

	Music	
	The LOGISTIC Procedure	
	Model Information	
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\musiclogistic.sas7bdat	
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status
Number of Response Levels	2	
Model	binary logit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Number of Observations Used 10031

<b>Response Profile</b>		
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency
1	1	6775
2	0	3256

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

Warning: The LOGISTIC procedure continues in spite of the above warning. Results shown are based on the last maximum likelihood iteration. Validity of the model fit is questionable.

Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates
AIC	12646.752	56.948
SC	12653.966	121.869
-2 Log L	12644.752	38.948

Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0			
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	12605.8041	8	<.0001
Score	2401.4334	8	<.0001
Wald	75.7419	8	<.0001

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-22.9226	5.6230	16.6183	<.0001
goal	1	-0.00255	0.00178	2.0630	0.1509
pledged	1	0.00264	0.00183	2.0714	0.1501
fper	1	0.2894	0.0598	23.4128	<.0001
backers	1	-0.00224	0.0183	0.0150	0.9025
levels	1	-0.0431	0.0962	0.2009	0.6540
updates	1	0.0311	0.0881	0.1248	0.7239
comments	1	0.1386	0.2038	0.4628	0.4963
duration	1	-0.0148	0.0211	0.4951	0.4817

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limi	ts	
goal	0.997	0.994 1.00	1	
pledged	1.003	0.999 1.00	6	

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	e 95% Wald Confidence Limi		
fper	1.336	1.188	1.502	
backers	0.998	0.963	1.034	
levels	0.958	0.793	1.157	
updates	1.032	0.868	1.226	
comments	1.149	0.770	1.713	
duration	0.985	0.945	1.027	

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses				
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000	
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000	
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.438	
Pairs	22059400	c	1.000	

Photography			
	The LOGISTIC Procedure		
	Model Information		
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\photographylogistic.sas7bdat		
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status	
Number of Response Levels	2		
Model	binary logit		
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring		

Number of Observations Read	1380	
Number of Observations Used	1380	

<b>Response Profile</b>				
Ordered status Value		Total Frequency		
1	1	643		
2	0	737		

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate does not exist.

<b>Model Fit Statistics</b>				
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates		
AIC	1908.678	19.945		
SC	1913.908	67.014		
-2 Log L	1906.678	1.945		

<b>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</b>						
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq			
Likelihood Ratio	1904.7333	8	<.0001			
Score	886.9217	8	<.0001			
Wald	8.5848	8	0.3785			

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-40.0793	24.4848	2.6795	0.1017
goal	1	0.000106	0.00305	0.0012	0.9723
pledged	1	-0.00013	0.00311	0.0018	0.9659
fper	1	0.4596	0.2433	3.5686	0.0589
backers	1	-0.0150	0.0453	0.1093	0.7410
levels	1	0.1957	0.7365	0.0706	0.7905
updates	1	0.0465	0.4406	0.0111	0.9160
comments	1	0.2400	0.9362	0.0657	0.7976
duration	1	-0.0280	0.0629	0.1978	0.6565

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% V Confidence	Vald e Limits	
goal	1.000	0.994	1.006	

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Lin		
pledged	1.000	0.994	1.006	
fper	1.584	0.983	2.551	
backers	0.985	0.901	1.077	
levels	1.216	0.287	5.151	
updates	1.048	0.442	2.485	
comments	1.271	0.203	7.964	
duration	0.972	0.860	1.100	

# Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses

Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.498
Pairs	473891	c	1.000

	Publishing	ľ
	The LOGISTIC Procedure	
	<b>Model Information</b>	
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\publishinglogistic.sas7bdat	
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status
Number of Response Levels	2	
Model	binary logit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Nu	mbei	of Obse	rvation	s Re	ad	4150
ът		6.01		ТT		41.50

<b>Response Profile</b>				
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency		
1	1	1669		
2	0	2481		

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

<b>Model Fit Statistics</b>				
Criterion	Criterion Intercept Intercept Only and Covariates			
AIC	5595.214	55.576		
SC	5601.545	112.553		
-2 Log L	5593.214	37.576		

<b>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</b>				
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq	
Likelihood Ratio	5555.6384	8	<.0001	
Score	1533.4531	8	<.0001	
Wald	57.6351	8	<.0001	

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-15.7012	4.1638	14.2194	0.0002
goal	1	-0.00140	0.000971	2.0912	0.1482
pledged	1	0.00129	0.000969	1.7707	0.1833
fper	1	0.2065	0.0416	24.6743	<.0001
backers	1	0.0136	0.0153	0.7862	0.3752
levels	1	-0.0369	0.1067	0.1196	0.7294
updates	1	-0.0117	0.0475	0.0609	0.8051
comments	1	0.0683	0.1606	0.1809	0.6706
duration	1	-0.00942	0.0246	0.1468	0.7016

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>			
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limi	
goal	0.999	0.997	1.000

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limit		
pledged	1.001	0.999 1.00	3	
fper	1.229	1.133 1.33	4	
backers	1.014	0.984 1.04	5	
levels	0.964	0.782 1.18	8	
updates	0.988	0.901 1.08	5	
comments	1.071	0.782 1.46	7	
duration	0.991	0.944 1.04	0	

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses				
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	0.999	
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000	
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.481	
Pairs	4140789	c	1.000	

	Technology	
	The LOGISTIC Procedure	
	Model Information	
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\technologylogistic.sas7bdat	
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status
Number of Response Levels	2	
Model	binary logit	
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring	

Number	of Observations	Read	732
1 (01110)01	01 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 0		

<b>Response Profile</b>				
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency		
1	1	288		
2	0	444		

Probability modeled is status=1.

# **Model Convergence Status**

Complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate does not exist.

Model Fit Statistics				
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates		
AIC	983.265	19.245		
SC	987.861	60.607		
-2 Log L	981.265	1.245		

<b>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</b>				
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq	
Likelihood Ratio	980.0207	8	<.0001	
Score	316.0467	8	<.0001	
Wald	4.7701	8	0.7818	

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates					
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-38.5154	19.4526	3.9203	0.0477
goal	1	0.000042	0.000077	0.2908	0.5897
pledged	1	-0.00009	0.000324	0.0712	0.7896
fper	1	0.4305	0.2006	4.6067	0.0318
backers	1	0.00175	0.0476	0.0013	0.9707
levels	1	-0.0481	0.5919	0.0066	0.9353
updates	1	0.1286	0.6576	0.0382	0.8450
comments	1	0.00855	0.1952	0.0019	0.9650
duration	1	-0.00460	0.0927	0.0025	0.9604

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>				
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits		
goal	1.000			

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>						
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits				
pledged	1.000					
fper	1.538					
backers	1.002					
levels	0.953					
updates	1.137					
comments	1.009					
duration	0.995					

# Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses

Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.478
Pairs	127872	c	1.000

Theater				
	The LOGISTIC Procedure			
	<b>Model Information</b>			
Data Set	C:\Users\tkb\Documents\My SAS Files\9.3\theaterlogistic.sas7bdat			
<b>Response Variable</b>	status	status		
Number of Response Levels	2			
Model	binary logit			
Optimization Technique	Fisher's scoring			

Num	ber	of	Obser	vations	Read	1	2315	

<b>Response Profile</b>				
Ordered Value	status	Total Frequency		
1	1	1636		
2	0	679		

Probability modeled is status=1.

#### **Model Convergence Status**

Quasi-complete separation of data points detected.

Warning: The maximum likelihood estimate may not exist.

<b>Model Fit Statistics</b>				
Criterion	Intercept Only	Intercept and Covariates		
AIC	2803.539	55.992		
SC	2809.286	107.717		
-2 Log L	2801.539	37.992		

<b>Testing Global Null Hypothesis: BETA=0</b>				
Test	Chi-Square	DF	Pr > ChiSq	
Likelihood Ratio	2763.5469	8	<.0001	
Score	713.6961	8	<.0001	
Wald	54.0540	8	<.0001	

Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates						
Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq	
Intercept	1	-17.9921	5.3579	11.2766	0.0008	
goal	1	-0.00090	0.00156	0.3322	0.5644	
pledged	1	0.000960	0.00159	0.3659	0.5452	
fper	1	0.2025	0.0499	16.4586	<.0001	
backers	1	-0.00510	0.0210	0.0593	0.8076	
levels	1	0.2322	0.1579	2.1626	0.1414	
updates	1	0.0419	0.1269	0.1092	0.7410	
comments	1	-0.0170	0.1701	0.0099	0.9205	
duration	1	0.0244	0.0275	0.7861	0.3753	

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>					
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits			
goal	0.999	0.996	1.002		

<b>Odds Ratio Estimates</b>						
Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits				
pledged	1.001	0.998	1.004			
fper	1.224	1.110	1.350			
backers	0.995	0.955	1.037			
levels	1.261	0.926	1.719			
updates	1.043	0.813	1.337			
comments	0.983	0.704	1.372			
duration	1.025	0.971	1.082			

Association of Predicted Probabilities and Observed Responses					
Percent Concordant	100.0	Somers' D	1.000		
Percent Discordant	0.0	Gamma	1.000		
Percent Tied	0.0	Tau-a	0.415		
Pairs	1110844	c	1.000		



