University of Economics in Katowice

Urszula Świerczyńska-Kaczor

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5368-0247

Faculty of Film Art Organization
The Polish National Film, Television
and Theatre School in Lodz, Lodz, Poland
uswierczynska@filmschool.lodz.pl

Małgorzata Kotlińska

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4160-7362

Faculty of Management
University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
malgorzata.kotlinska@unilodz.eu

Monika Żelazowska

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6985-2517

Faculty of Film Art Organization
The Polish National Film, Television
and Theatre School in Lodz, Lodz, Poland
mzelazowska@filmschool.lodz.pl

Implementation of agile approach in a reward-based crowdfunding project aimed at funding a film: An overview of the concept and challenges

Abstract

Aim/purpose – The research aims to identify and evaluate factors impacting the implementation of an agile approach in a crowdfunding project with a goal to fund a film.
Design/methodology/approach – The research was conducted in March-April 2018, and based on qualitative methods of gathering data from the Polish market.
Findings – We point to the two groups of factors impacting whether or not a film team can implement the agile approach in a crowdfunding project: 1) the first group of factors refers to the iterative testing of 'the work produced' during the project, including testing of final film elements; 2) the second group of factors refers to team management such as team goal, team engagement and communication, and conflicts between team members. The findings indicate that a potential transition to the agile approach would require significant adjustments of the current methods of conducting film projects.

Research implications/limitations – The managerial implications of this discussion may lead to raising the filmmakers' familiarity with the agile approach as a new project management framework for the Polish filmmakers. The limitations of the presented study are mostly connected with the qualitative methods applied in the process of gathering data.

Originality/value/contribution – This paper provides useful insights into the methods of project management in the film industry.

Keywords: film project management, the agile film project management, the crowdfunding film project.
JEL Classification: M12, O32.

1. Introduction

The project management literature review indicates that the agile approach contributes to the project success, not only in IT projects, but – more generally – the agile approach can be useful in various projects (e.g. Sutherland, 2014). Can the agile methodology also address the problems in the management of film projects? With this paper, we hope to start a broader discussion, whether and how the agile approach can be implemented in the film industry.

In this text, we deliberately consider only a selected situation in the management of film projects – we centre the discussion on the stage of film financing through crowdfunding. The justification of our focus on this topic is as follows: a crowdfunding project is more closely related to the production of an effectively working online campaign rather than the production of the film itself. As the agile approach is primarily linked to IT projects, the crowdfunding campaign – with its crowdfunding website and the design of social media communication on the one hand, and the links to the final film on the other – seems to be the first choice and a 'good start' for the analysis on how to transfer the 'IT agile style of working' to 'the film sector'.

So far, the literature referring to the project management in the Polish film industry focuses mostly on the discussion 'how films should be made' according to the current, best practices (e.g. Zabłocki, 2013; Zajiček, 1981, 1997). Taking into account both the Polish and the worldwide literature, the problems of agile project management in filmmaking have hardly been investigated on a theoretical or empirical level, although it is worth noting that some interesting texts about agile or lean film production have been published recently, for example, Lamont (2017). In this paper we aim to partly fill this research gap as the objective of our research is to identify and evaluate the factors impacting the implementation of the agile approach in the reward-based crowdfunding project with

the goal to fund a film. We would like to emphasise that we focus on getting the big picture – how the transition of agile concepts may or may not work – rather than seeking a new theoretical framework, and in this text we refer mainly to the results of our empirical study conducted in 2018 and our professional experience.

We structure this paper in the following way. In section 2 we characterise the nature of reward-based crowdfunding projects and present an overview of the agile principles to which we refer in our empirical study. Section 3 presents our research questions which focus on two selected aspects of agile project management: the concept of continuous testing and experimenting whether the project delivers value to users, and the problem of how to organise the team and the teamwork. This part of the text also presents the research methods of gathering data. The next section 4 points to our research findings: the potential problems with the implementation of the agile approach. The paper ends with conclusions, the discussion of the limitations of our research and the presentation of directions for future studies.

2. Theoretical background

The process of film production, resulting in an audiovisual work as a master copy, is based on three stages: pre-production, production and post-production (Zajiček, 1981). The film pre-production stage includes the preliminary tasks, for example, developing a film idea, writing a film script and acquisition of rights to use a screenplay, cost estimation and film scheduling, first employment of the major film team members (director, operator, production manager), and making test shots (in the pre-production phase, film locations are set, necessary permissions are obtained, and film documentation is collected). The next phase is the critical phase as it is the actual film shooting: on location and/or in the studio. Then, the post-production phase follows, and it includes such tasks as image and sound editing, performing the visual and sound effects, and preparation of end and opening credits.

In film production, the film producer secures the film funding in the pre-production phase. On the Polish market, film funding is mostly based on subsidies from the Polish Film Institute – PISF. However, with the growth of the crowdfunding market, film producers or film directors more often turn to gathering funds online from 'the Internet crowd' – from the backers (sponsors). The majority of film projects on the Polish market are conducted as reward-based crowdfunding projects, in which the backers (sponsors) select a tier of rewards corresponding with a selected level of financial support. For example, as a re-

ward the backer can (often) select the final product (DVD film, online film download), gadgets (e.g. mugs, T-shirts), rewards linked to social recognition (e.g. a 'thank you' note on social media, putting the name of the backer in the film credits or even a poem written in honour of a sponsor), collectable film memorabilia (e.g. poster, parts of set decoration, script, film stills) or experiential rewards (e.g. after-party invitation, tour of the film sets).

In its essence, the crowdfunding film project is more closely connected to creating the website (and its promotion) than the actual film production, and the project founder – the film director/film producer – manages some tasks which are very distant from the traditional film project (e.g. producing a promotional video at the film-funding stage, designing rewards). For our further discussion, it is important to note the connection between a particular crowdfunding campaign and the final film. In this aspect the crowdfunding projects significantly vary, and they incorporate the final film elements differently. Let us consider the following illustrative examples:

1. The project creator presents only the overall film idea and they seek funding for the project which incorporates almost all the tasks in the film production, starting from the actual screenplay development.
2. The project creator seeks funding for the actual film shooting having the developed film script. In this situation, our project delivers the crowdfunding website, but the crowdfunding campaign can incorporate an element of the final film – the script.
3. The project creator seeks funding for the post-production stage. In this situation, the crowdfunding campaign and the final film are more closely aligned, and the number of elements of the final film which can be included and used in the crowdfunding campaign rises significantly, for example, it can be film music, film excerpts, presentation of different film endings, film trailer, or film teaser.

These three situations illustrate that although our primary task is always to build the crowdfunding website (the project account on the crowdfunding platform), the crowdfunding campaign also creates a unique opportunity for testing and experimenting with the elements of the final product – the film itself. Even when the crowdfunding project fails to gather the funding, the aspect of 'testing the elements of the final product' can be valuable for the filmmakers: it may help improve the film development (and in some cases these projects are eventually funded from alternative sources to crowdfunding, or by setting another crowdfunding project). However, independently from the failure or success of the crowdfunding campaign, the team gains some insight into the potential viewers' experience of the final film due to the testing of its elements. It may be

presumed that the aspect of 'testing' may also build the backers' involvement and help gather the funding during the campaign.

To sum up this point of discussion – some crowdfunding projects create opportunity for filmmakers to include elements of the final film for testing. Testing and experimenting whether the crowdfunding campaign or the elements of final film bring 'real value' for the viewers (the backers) is also a dimension of agile project management.

The literature on the agile project management covers different frameworks which include, for example, the Scrum, Kanban, Extreme Programming (XP), Dynamic Systems Development Method (DSDM), and Feature Driven Development (for example: Agile Practice Guide, 2017; Chmielarz, 2015; Dingsøyr, Nerur, Balijepally, & Moe, 2012; Rasnacis & Berzisa, 2017). In this paper, we bring the agile general principles as a framework for the discussion, although we mostly keep in mind the Scrum as the agile method (Table 1). As the agile approach is useful for the project with poorly defined scope, when the duration of tasks cannot be accurately evaluated, with unknown tasks dependencies, and unknown availability of resources (e.g. Nicholls, Lewis & Eschenbach, 2015), we argue that the crowdfunding project, gathering the funds for a film production, meets these requirements: the scope of each project is unique and there is no standard way in which the filmmakers can design the overall campaign.

Table 1. The selected principles of the agile approach – the literature review

The results are constantly checked whether what is being produced has value or not for users	• This concept is based on producing the minimum viable products and – its continuous checking and experimenting whether or not the product meets the value required by users. • Continuous testing allows the implementation of quick changes if they are needed. In this situation 'the production of waste' is limited as there is an instant verification of value being delivered in the project
Work prioritisation – how to deliver the most value first	• The project is focused on prioritising the work in accordance to its value for the user. The Product Backlog can be constantly updated and re-prioritised as the project is progressing and the concept of 'the real value' required by the users can be defined in a more detailed way
The focus is on the people and the effective teamwork	• The work is done by a small, self-organising team with multi-disciplinary skills. • It is essential to build transparent and open communication within the team and with the different stakeholders. The work's progress is visualised in order to create 'transparency' and 'openness' on how the project has been managed. • The agile approach requires the high engagement of team members to achieve the set goals and the agile team should be focused on collaborative work and pluralist decision-making

Source: Based on: Chmielarz (2015); Lindsjørn, Sjøberg, Dingsøyr, Bergersen, & Dybå (2016); Schwaber & Sutherland (2017); Sutherland (2014).

3. Research methodology

In this paper we aim to identify and evaluate the factors which make the implementation of the agile approach in the reward-based crowdfunding project feasible. However, the research and discussion is limited to the following problems:

1. What factors have an impact on whether or not the agile principles of 'continuous testing and experimenting of value delivered' can be implemented in the film project? (research question 1).
2. What factors have an impact on whether or not the agile principle of how the team and the teamwork are organised can be implemented in the film project? (research question 2).

These problems lie in the area of broader research of how an organisation adjusts its functioning to the agile methods. Shifting from the 'usual waterfall' to the agile methodology demands organisational changes in different areas: in management and organisational issues (e.g. organisational culture, management style, reward systems), people (e.g. collaboration with customers), processes, and technology (Nerur, Mahapatra, & Mangalaraj, 2005). However, the transition to agile is different in the case of crowdfunding projects than in the majority of IT projects as:

1. The film team is (usually) organised outside the formal organisation.
2. The film projects are often perceived as 'a one-time endeavour' by the team members, rather than being within the portfolio of the current and future projects managed by the formal organisation.
3. The shift would not be from the 'standardised waterfall' to agile, but rather from 'the routine practice in filmmaking' to the agile methodology.

We based our analysis on the following data sources:

1. Data gathered during the empirical study aimed to evaluate the experience and the expectation of Polish filmmakers about crowdfunding. The methodology of this study, conducted in March and April 2018, was based on qualitative methods of gathering data including interviews, a semi-structured questionnaire, and the analysis of crowdfunding case studies. The 40 respondents – both Polish experienced filmmakers and students in the field of film directing, photography or film producing – were asked about different aspects of project management; however, we did not directly use the terms 'agile methodology' or 'lean management' as these terms are almost non-existent with

reference to filmmaking. Instead, we asked respondents what their opinions are about principles of agile thinking, for example:

– What do the filmmakers think about testing the outline of the script during the crowdfunding campaign?
– What do the filmmakers think about the communication or the conflicts between the team members conducting the crowdfunding project?

2. Data which came from our observations of film productions. In this paper we draw significantly on our experience gathered by observation and participation in film productions.

4. Research findings and discussion

4.1. Testing and experimenting of value delivered in a project

At this point of the paper, we look for answers to the first research question: What factors have an impact on whether or not the agile principle of 'continuous testing and experimenting of value delivered' can be implemented in the film project?

The crowdfunding project account can be perceived as a type of website, posted on a reward-based crowdfunding platform, and this website (account/profile of founder) usually comprises the pre-defined layout (options) for development of the following elements:

1. The promotional video.
2. The project description: aim of the project, potential risks connected with project execution (risks may impact the delivery of rewards to backers).
3. The structure of the reward tiers available for backers.
4. The reference to other online communication channels for the potential backers (e.g. hyperlinks to social media).

The crowdfunding founder and their team (a film crew) face at least the following 'unknowns': to what extent the crowdfunding account should be backed by activity on social media (the project scope), the type of promotional video (e.g. mood film, the presentation of previous work of the film director/the film producer, the outline of the script – different types of promotional video require different resources), what kind of reward tiers would be suitable for this particular project.

At first glance, the principle of continuous testing of the concept of the campaign may be successfully applied, as for example:

1. The crowdfunding team can develop the product backlog referring to the desired features of the crowdfunding campaign. In the process of the development of product backlog (user stories, features of crowdfunding account) and its prioritisation, the film team can refer to the growing scope of studies in the literature on crowdfunding (e.g. Steigenberger, 2017; Thürridl & Kamleitner, 2016; Zheng, Xu, Wang, & Xu, 2017).

2. The team can experiment with different content and message (including the social media communication) and receive continuous feedback from potential backers. For example, within the communication on social media we can ask the backers what kind of rewards they would be interested in, and we can try to modify the reward tiers according to their feedback.

Moreover, one of the principles of agile do not produce anything which does not bring a value for a user and therefore this 'zero waste approach' (visible also in the lean management) can be applied 'literally' to the manufacturing of rewards for backers: in this case the demand for a particular type of reward can trigger the actual production.

In the situation of testing whether 'the crowdfunding campaign' brings value to backers, the 'value' is linked to different backers' motives, for example, altruistic motives to support the art project, backer's willingness to watch a particular film in the future, backer's support of friend who is involved in this film production (family and friends are often the major groups supporting the project). As to the indicators whether our project is going in the right direction, we can point to the backers' payments as a prime metric. For example, we can analyse the changes in the backers' payment in relation to the 'tested' element of the campaign.

Another situation occurs when we test the elements of the final film. In this case, we verify 'the different kind of value' compared with the situation of 'testing the crowdfunding campaign'. Consider the following situation: when we ask the backers whether or not they like the outline of the script or the film trailer, we receive feedback which is the backers' evaluation of their experience with this final product (the film itself), but not necessarily their evaluation of the crowdfunding campaign. In this case, we can also set the qualitative and quantitative metrics showing whether the film project is going in the right direction. For example: the number of trailer downloads, the number of sharing the film

elements on social media, the relationship between the positive and negative comments written on the social media by backers.

Although the testing of the elements of the final film seems to be possible, the important question is whether it is feasible – do the filmmakers agree with such testing or do they perceive it as too much interference in the creative project? In our study, the respondents' reactions to the question – whether the changes in the presented outline of the script may be introduced according to the backers' remarks – were mixed (Table 2). The negative voices of respondents highlighted the necessity for the independence of film creators, but the positive answers pointed to the possible 'small adjustments' of the screenplay and the need for continuing work on the script. However, the majority of respondents emphasised that the changes should be 'small in scope' (not crucial to the screenplay). These results are in line with the widely held opinion that Polish screenwriters are not eager to introduce any changes to their script (Hendrykowski, 2012).

In our analysis of case studies, we did not find situations in which such elements as the film trailer, the music or the film excerpts were tested. Although, such testing conducted with the backers is possible, it raises the following questions:

1. Are we able to gather 'true' feedback from backers? It may happen that the potential backers are more likely give positive feedback, and they would not like to criticise the project. It often happens that the presentation of creative work to friends leads to receiving fewer critical opinions.
2. To what extent this type of testing could spoil the future viewer's experience?
3. Is the quality of the tested material 'good enough' for building the professional brand for the members of the film crew, particularly the film director, the film producer or the actors? The film creators often do not like to present anything which is 'not perfect' as they perceive each presentation of creative work as a time for building their reputation and their brand.
4. Do the film scenes presented to the backers interfere with the future promotion, such as an officially distributed film trailer? On the Polish film market, the film distributor often has exclusive rights for controlling the whole process of film distribution. Therefore, the disclosure of film scenes during the crowdfunding campaign may be in conflict with the distributor's future rights.

4.2. Organising teamwork in a project

At this point of the text, we investigate the second research question: What factors have an impact on whether or not the agile principles of how the team and the teamwork is organised can be implemented in the film project?

In this area, we have analysed the findings within two groups of factors (with reference to the selected aspects of the model presented in the paper – Ozierańska, Skomra, Kuchta, & Rola, 2016):

1. The project team factors with sub-categories: spatial factors, composition of the team, team goals.
2. The psychological and cultural category of factors, such as teamwork, relationships in the team and attitude of team members.

   Our research results are as follows:

1. The composition of the team – considering a 'typical' team in the crowdfunding project from our case studies, we point out that the size of the crowdfunding film team matches 'the desirable' small size of the agile team – about 6 to 9 members. However, in our survey, the respondents varied strongly in their opinions on who should or should not be included in the crowdfunding team (Table 2). Some respondents indicated that the crowdfunding project can be separated from the film project itself and a creative team should not be engaged 'just in the funding stage'. The other respondents indicated the opposite point of view – a large film crew should be engaged from the start, including the stage of fund gathering. However, it is difficult to define the role of film team members using Scrum terminology. The film producer can be named the 'Product Owner' as the film producer is responsible for delivering the 'product' to the audience. But the film producer also plays the role of Scrum Master, being responsible for removing impediments in the process of production. In some cases, it is not the film producer who is the project founder, but the film director. Another aspect is also the multiple roles in the one crowdfunding film project played by the team members. In one case study, the project founder was a debuting film director and debuting screenwriter, and the respondent indicated this fact as one of the factors impacting the project failure.

2. The spatial factor – the majority of respondents perceived the situation 'working in one room' as positively impacting the project, but the respondents clearly indicated that, in many crowdfunding cases, this concept could not be realistically applied. It would be even more difficult to introduce

a 'one-room workplace' if we consider a crowdfunding campaign for a film produced as a foreign film co-production. In this case, the virtual communication between team members would probably extend the scope of the potential problems.

3. The team goals – it seems that we can define the success of the film crowdfunding project as to receive the funds (at least) to the set threshold level. However, this definition of the successful film project may be considered too narrow. The following examples are from the case studies we analysed:
    − the film project gathered the funding, but the film was not produced;
    − the film project gathered the funding, the film was produced, but the quality of the film was poor;
    − the film project had not gathered the funding during the crowdfunding campaign, but nevertheless the film was produced as the crowdfunding helped to develop the film;
    − the film gathered the funding and was not fully produced, but nevertheless the rewards were sent to the backers.

The situations indicated above illustrate that success of the crowdfunding project may hold a different meaning for team members and various aspects of success may have a different importance for them. For example, the director can perceive the success mostly in the dimension of the final film development, but in the same project, the film producer can be mostly concerned with the production and delivery of the rewards to backers. We presume that discrepancies in how to define the success can affect the team members' engagement in the crowdfunding project.

4. The difficulty to build an engaged team due to the 'part time' approach and 'being a film co-creator':
    − The majority of respondents (57%) stated that it could be a problem to build a fully engaged team as the crowdfunding project is often an additional job or the team members perceive the crowdfunding project as 'the job for art for art's sake', not necessarily leading to a potential income (Table 2). This 'part-time' approach to the crowdfunding project may explain other concerns indicated by respondents, such as: not meeting the deadlines of tasks (50% of respondents indicated this problem), or the uneven workload between the team members (45% of respondents).
    − The next issue which is linked to the team engagement is the legal aspects of film production. According to the Polish legal regulations, a co-creator of audiovisual project is a person who creatively contributed to the cre-

ation of the audiovisual work. The film director, the screenwriter, the creator of the adaptation of the literary work, the author of the dialogues, and the creator of the music are considered the 'co-creators'; however, a film producer is usually not. We do not know to what extent this situation of being 'a film co-creator' or 'not a film co-creator' – the situation being so different compared with a 'typical IT project' – would impact on the person's work within the agile team, should the agile approach be introduced.

5. The difficulty in building open and transparent communication between team members. About half of the respondents indicated that the lack of task co-ordination and inefficient communication between the team members would be potential problems in crowdfunding project management.

6. The conflicts between the team members. The majority of respondents (55%) indicated that they have to take into account potentially disruptive conflicts between the film producer and the film director. However, in creative media the conflicts between the members of the creative team seem to play a special role, and as Lamont (2017) indicated – the creative friction in the team can lead to amazing work. Our study does not indicate to what extent we can perceive the conflicts pointed out by respondents as 'creative, not destructive, forces'.

4.3. Summary of findings

We would like to highlight that in our research we did not find an actual crowdfunding project which was purposefully managed with the agile approach. Therefore, the presented discussion cannot be viewed through the question to what extent the agile methodology contributes to project success or will result, e.g. in cost savings, or the shortening of the project duration. In our research, with 'the justified assumption' that the agile approach can also be valuable for the crowdfunding (as it is to other creative projects), we looked into the factors which can impact on the process of agile implementation.

Below, we present the summarised results of the empirical research in the Table 3, and the illustrative respondents' statements in Table 2. As we pointed out in our research framework description, it is difficult to compare our findings with the literature review which mostly refer to IT projects, conducted within established organisational settings.

Table 2. Illustrative respondents' statements gathered during research

The selected aspect of the agile approach in the crowdfunding project	The illustrative respondents' statements
The script testing with the potential viewers	"This feedback idea can hype the project, but the diversity of backers' opinion would not lead to the constructive changes." "It should be only the backers' opinions, the creators should think independently." "Small changes yes, the major one – definitely not."
The composition of the team	"The energy of film creators should not be wasted on the crowdfunding project, but it should be saved for the creative work." "It is a very good idea to engage the film creators in the crowdfunding campaign, as they can much more fully explain their artistic concept to the backers and the potential audience." "The screenwriter can help build the text content on the crowdfunding account, the director of photography is helpful in the promotional video production."
The team engagement	"In the beginning the team members did not believe that the crowdfunding film project would be successful." "Only two persons were engaged in the process of asking friends for the support of our project."
Conflict between team members	"The film producers always think that they know everything." "It was a conflict between the film producer, the film director and the director of photography. We could not find common ground. The crowdfunding project failed."

Source: Authors' own research.

Table 3. Factors having a positive and negative impact on the process of the implementation of the agile approach in the crowdfunding project aiming at funding a film

The agile principle	Factor	Impact on the implementation of agile
Continuous testing of the work produced	Testing the elements of the crowdfunding campaign such as the content of the crowd-funding website (account)	Positive, the 'testing' seems to be feasible and can help develop the project
	Testing of the outline of the script, and other elements of final film	Negative, the concept of 'testing whether the work delivers the value' cannot be 'directly and smoothly' transferred to the crowdfunding project. The team may or may not reach agreement whether to conduct the test or not
Agile approach how the work and team is organised	Small teams, self-organised team	Positive
	Team goal: the team members can differ on how to understand 'the film success'	Negative
	The low team engagement	Negative
	The difficulty to have daily, face-to-face communication in a 'one-room workplace'	Negative
	The problems with establishing the effective communication between the team members	Negative
	The high likelihood of conflicts among team members	Negative

Source: Authors' own research.

5. Conclusions and research implications, research limitations and future research

5.1. Conclusions and research implications

In this paper, we argue that the crowdfunding project aiming at funding a film – the project with its 'blurred lines' of scope and required resources, and its unpredictability – can be viewed as a type of a project suited for the agile approach. Our findings clearly indicate that the transition from 'the usual way' of conducting project to the agile methodology would not be 'easy' for the filmmakers, and the gap between 'how the things are usually done' and 'the agile principles' seems to be large. However, we are also certain that the transition to the agile approach is feasible, and with the focus on a particular project we note that the film crew can discuss how to 'use' the agile principles, taking into account a particular crowdfunding project's characteristics. Moreover, as the respondents mentioned that they often face 'various inefficiencies' linked to the project management (e.g. ineffective communication), we may presume that these 'perceived wastes' may encourage the filmmakers to try on the new approach.

As to the managerial implication of our research, we can point to the process in which the Polish filmmakers become familiar with agile project management. Our teaching experience indicates that the project agile methodology has become more widely taught within the Polish film-making curriculum. Therefore, it may be presumed that in the ensuing years, as the students and future film-makers gain more insight, this would lead to more interest in the implementation of the agile approach in future projects.

5.2. Research limitations

In most cases, the crowdfunding projects aiming at funding a film and listed on Polish crowdfunding platforms are projects with small and moderate budgets. Therefore, it may be presumed that respondents mostly refer to such kinds of projects in their answers, and the findings do not cover larger film productions.

The presented study was based on qualitative methods of gathering data. Therefore, the limitations of the study are linked to the convenient sample of respondents who agreed to share their views about crowdfunding and/or the crowdfunding project experience, and to the subjectivity of the assessment of

respondents' statements. However, as the discussed problem is very new in the literature, the qualitative research allows for building the base for further, both qualitative and quantitative, research.

We are aware that this discussion does not cover the whole spectrum of problems of agile implementation – the presented research was exploratory in nature, and we primarily aimed to outline the problems and look for new questions and problems for future research.

5.3. Future research

Further interesting studies lie in the area of the implementation of the agile and/or lean approach in the phase of the actual film shooting. However, this research topic is similar to the above presented discussion only at first glance. The major difference lies in the aspects of 'the user' and 'the value' which the project delivers – at the actual film shooting stage, the 'continuous testing' of film elements would be mostly focused on the value as it is perceived by the filmmakers, not the final audience. In this case, the question is not – "does this film scene deliver value to the viewer?" – but it would be rather stated as – "does the pre-edited film material produced after a day of film shooting meet the 'value criterion' set by the film director?"

Another interesting line of future research is the possible implementation of the agile approach in the situations where the crowdfunding film project includes the 360-degree video. The 360-degree video is much more of a 'viewer--centered' production than a 'traditional' film as the 360-degree video changes viewer's role: from 'just viewing' to a viewer who is actively involved in the process of film watching. In this case, the testing of the film scenes can also embrace the respondent's preferable way to navigate the film and their responses to the clues which build the film story.

Acknowledgments

References

Agile Practice Guide. (2017). Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute.

Chmielarz, W. (2015). *Information technology project management.* Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Zarządzania Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Dingsøyr, T., Nerur, S., Balijepally, V. G., & Moe, N. B. (2012). A decade of agile methodologies: Towards explaining agile software development. *Journal of Systems and Software, 85*(6), 1213-1221. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2012.02.033

Hendrykowski, M. (2012). Scenariusz filmowy i jego odmiany. Studium przedmiotu [The screenplay and its variants: Study of the subject.]. *Images, XI*(20), 133-150. Retrieved from https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/bitstream/10593/7072/1/Marek%20Hendrykowski%20-%20Scenariusz%20filmowy%20i%20jego%20odmiany.%20Studium%20przedmiotu.pdf

Lamont, I. (2017). *Lean media. How to focus creativity, streamline production, and create media that audiences love*. Newton, MA: i30 Media Corporation.

Lindsjørn, Y., Sjøberg, D. I. K., Dingsøyr, T., Bergersen, G. R., & Dybå, T. (2016). Teamwork quality and project success in software development: A survey of agile development teams. *Journal of Systems and Software, 122,* 274-286. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2016.09.028

Nicholls, G. M., Lewis, N. A., & Eschenbach, T. (2015). Determining when simplified agile project management is right for small teams. *Engineering Management Journal, 27*(1), 3-10. http://doi.org/10.1080/10429247.2015.11432031

Nerur, S., Mahapatra, R. K., & Mangalaraj, G. (2005). Challenges of migrating to agile methodologies. *Communications of the ACM – Adaptive complex enterprises, 48*(5), 72-78. http://doi.org/10.1145/1060710.1060712

Ozierańska, A., Skomra, A., Kuchta, D., & Rola, P. (2016). The critical factors of Scrum implementation in IT project – the case study. *Journal of Economics & Management, 25*(3), 79-96. http://doi.org/10.22367/jem.2016.25.06

Rasnacis, A., & Berzisa, S. (2017). Method for adaptation and implementation of agile project management methodology. *Procedia Computer Science, 104*, 43-50. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.01.055

Schwaber, K., & Sutherland, J. (2017). *The Scrum Guide™. The definitive guide to Scrum: The rules of the game*. Retrieved from https://www.scrumguides.org/docs/scrumguide/v2017/2017-Scrum-Guide-US.pdf#zoom=100

Steigenberger, N. (2017). Why supporters contribute to reward-based crowdfunding. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 23*(2), 336-353. http://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-04-2016-0117

Sutherland, J. (2014). *Scrum: The art of doing twice the work in half the time*. London: Random House Business Books.

Thürridl, C., & Kamleitner, B. (2016). What goes around comes around? Rewards as strategic assets in crowdfunding. *California Management Review, 58*(2), 88-110. http://doi.org/10.1525%2Fcmr.2016.58.2.88

Zabłocki, M. (2013). *Organizacja produkcji filmu fabularnego w Polsce [Organization of feature film production in Poland]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Marzec.

Zajiček, E. (1981). *Wybrane zagadnienia ekonomiki produkcji filmowej* [Selected issues of economics of film production]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Radia i Telewizji.

Zajiček, E. (1997). *Praca i film. Problemy ekonomiki pracy w produkcji filmowej. System pracy, elementy, relacje, struktura*. Tom I [Work and film. The problems of work economics in film production. The work system, elements, relations, structure. Volume I]. Łódź: Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Filmowa, Telewizyjna i Teatralna, Dział Wydawniczy.

Zheng, H., Xu, B., Wang, T., & Xu, Y. (2017). An empirical study of sponsor satisfaction in reward-based crowdfunding. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research, 18*(3), 269-285. Retrieved from http://www.jecr.org/node/531