ECONSTOR

Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of



Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Rahmah, Aisha Sonetya; Pratama, Nauval Rafa; Kuswadi, Shafina Aulia; Ichsan, Mohammad

Article

The effectiveness of implementing agile project management: A systematic literature review

Global Business & Finance Review (GBFR)

Provided in Cooperation with:

People & Global Business Association (P&GBA), Seoul

Suggested Citation: Rahmah, Aisha Sonetya; Pratama, Nauval Rafa; Kuswadi, Shafina Aulia; Ichsan, Mohammad (2024) : The effectiveness of implementing agile project management: A systematic literature review, Global Business & Finance Review (GBFR), ISSN 2384-1648, People & Global Business Association (P&GBA), Seoul, Vol. 29, Iss. 6, pp. 170-186, https://doi.org/10.17549/gbfr.2024.29.6.170

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/306021

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.



https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.







GLOBAL BUSINESS & FINANCE REVIEW, Volume. 29 Issue. 6 (JULY 2024), 170-186 pISSN 1088-6931 / eISSN 2384-1648 | Https://doi.org/10.17549/gbfr.2024.29.6.170 © 2024 People and Global Business Association

GLOBAL BUSINESS & FINANCE REVIEW

www.gbfrjournal.org for financial sustainability and people-centered global business

The Effectiveness of Implementing Agile Project Management: A Systematic Literature Review

Aisha Sonetya Rahmah^a, Nauval Rafa Pratama^a, Shafina Aulia Kuswadi^a,

Mohammad Ichsan^b

^aManagement Program, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia ^bManagement Department, BINUS Business School Undergraduate Program, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The paper's primary goal is to provide a concise summary of the key challenges associated with agile project management (APM) and how these challenges affect the overall effectiveness of APM.

Design/methodology/approach: The authors used a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology to synthesize research rigorously. Two hundred papers were identified in the first step, and a final sample of 95 paper studies was synthesized.

Findings: The findings of this study reveal a total of 677 factors from various papers that have been classified into four distinct categories: customer, organizational, team, and project management methodology (PMM). The primary obstacles to implementing APM encompass knowledge, culture, characteristics, support, and communication. **Research limitations/implications:** Further analysis still needs to be done to explore how to overcome challenges in implementing APM.

Originality/value: This study will be used as a reference as a starting point for further qualitative and quantitative studies to explore the effectiveness of APM.

Keywords: Challenge, Agile Project Management

I. Introduction

Agile project management (APM) development is increasing rapidly in the 21st century (Bergmann & Karwowski, 2019). This method has been widely adopted in software development and large-scale projects (Dingsøyr et al., 2018). In management structures, agile tends to be democratic toward project management compared to traditional structures (Marder et al., 2021). Agile has been tested on project productivity and stakeholder satisfaction with organizational goals in 1002 projects across sectors and nations (Serrador & Pinto, 2015). Many companies also implement APM or organizational agility because it can influence firm performance. This is because organizations that implement APM are more responsive and adaptable. Leaders foster collaboration, which reduces risk and improves communication. Therefore, leadership competencies must continue to be developed to survive in the face of disruption (Alamsjah, 2022).

[©] Copyright: The Author(s). This is an Open Access journal distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Received: Sep. 20, 2023; Revised: Nov. 8, 2023; Accepted: Nov. 24, 2023

[†] Corresponding author: Mohammad Ichsan

E-mail: mohammad.ichsan@binus.edu

However, many organizations still face challenges in implementing APM. The three main challenges are organization, people, and processes (Collignon et al., 2022; Sithambaram et al., 2021). Lack of support from executives for a culture that is not in line is a challenge in an organization. Other studies have also shown that conflicts arise due to miscommunications, which can lead to negative emotions such as resentment and hostility (Baik & Kang, 2020). In addition, effective communication can significantly impact knowledge at individual and team levels (Choi & Jeong, 2022).

This study aims to explore the application of APM globally and summarize the challenges faced. Further research is needed to determine the effectiveness of APM practices.

This paper is structured as follows: Part 2 provides a brief overview of the theories used in project management and APM. Part 3 presents the methods, search strategies, and selected journal articles. Part 4 presents detailed results and analysis of the critical challenges of implementing APM. Part 5 presents the conclusions of this study.

II. Literature Review

A. Project Management

Project management involves completing a business on time, in time, and to scope. According to the Project Management Body of Knowledge 5th edition, it's the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to meet project needs (Edkins et al., 2013).

Project management focuses on achieving shortterm tactical goals by controlling cost, time, and quality (Lappi & Aaltonen, 2017). It provides solutions for effective project management, benefiting the company (Ichsan & Soebandrija, 2021). Good project management aligns project objectives with the organization's strategic goals (Stormi et al., 2019). Different methodologies, like the waterfall method (PMBOK, PRINCE2) and agile methods (Scrum, DSDM, Agile Unified Process, FDD, Lean Startup, XP), offer various structures for project production (Raharjo & Purwandari, 2020).

Project management methodology is a step-by-step approach with proven frameworks and templates. Factors influencing project success are categorized into Customer, Organizational, Project, and Team (Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015). The customer organization factor involves external influences from the parent organization (Howell et al., 2010).

B. Agile Project Management

Over the past two decades, APM has replaced waterfall approaches (Sharma et al., 2022). The word "agile" is often interpreted as a flexible approach in project management with high complexity and uncertainty (Zavyalova et al., 2020). Dynamic capability theory highlights the necessity for businesses to adapt, consolidate, upgrade, update, and configure resources to capitalize on possibilities (Teece' et al., 1997).

According to the Person-Organization theory, relevance and competency are determined by the fit between human abilities, needs, values and organizational requirements (Kristof, 1996). Individuals who are members of agile teams must have a prominent level of experience regarding abilities through regular task feedback (Koch & Schermuly, 2021).

Kanban, Scrum, XP, Crystal, and DSDM are all options for this APM. Scrum is the most popular method with tens of thousands of users over 25 years. Scrum and XP are often used jointly for software testing and engineering quality (F. Tripp & Armstrong, 2018).

III. Method

This study employed qualitative methods for data collection and analysis, emphasizing interpretive and

naturalistic approaches. Qualitative research involves examining elements in the environment, interpreting events based on people's meanings, and studying various aspects. Examples of empirical materials in qualitative research include case studies, subjective experiences, life stories, interviews, observations, and texts describing routines and meanings in an individual's life. Qualitative research also involves collecting various empirical materials (Kasinath, 2013).

A systematic literature review is a systematic way to collect, critically evaluate, integrate, and present results from numerous studies on research questions or topics of interest (Pati & Lorusso, 2018). This method interprets and deepens research results, but it's time-consuming to identify and evaluate studies. Thus, a Systematic Literature Review requires predetermined and transparent steps. This study used the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta- Analyses (PRISMA) to conduct a Systematic Literature Review on APM challenges. There are four main steps in PRISMA: identification, screening, feasibility and abstraction, and data analysis (Ismail et al., 2021).

A. Identification

The first step in the Systematic Literature Review is identifying relevant articles on the Challenges of APM. ScienceDirect, Emerald, Taylor & Francis, Sage, and Inderscience are sites used to collect international articles. These publishers were chosen for their well-established indexing system and to ensure the quality of the reviewed articles. Articles are identified using keywords such as "Agile Project Management," or "Challenge," or "Project" in titles, abstracts, and keywords.

B. Screening

The second step is a screening process where articles are includes or excludes based on criteria

 Table 1. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Paper

 Selection

Criteria	Inclusion	Exclusion
Publication timeline	2013-2023	before 2013
Document Type	Regular Journal	Manuscript, Pre-Print
Language	English	Non-English



Figure 1. Paper selection process

determined by the author using a specific database. Criteria such as inclusion and exclusion are used to find suitable articles for the State of the Art. Articles published from 2013 to 2023 were chosen to discuss the challenges of APM in the last ten years. The selected articles are from regular journals and in English (Table 1).

C. Eligibility

The third stage is the eligibility process, where articles are selected based on the author's criteria. This process is done manually for discussion about APM (Figure 1). After the review, the author managed to get 95 articles about APM.

D. Data Abstraction and Analysis

In the final stage, data is abstracted and analyzed. The remaining articles are evaluated and analyzed, and the 95 selected articles will be discussed in detail. Reviews are based on specific studies matching the research question and objectives. The articles are then summarized to identify relevant topics and subtopics by reading the title, the abstract, and the entire content.

IV. Results

A thorough analysis of APM research has been conducted including 95 scholarly papers (Table 2). Many scholarly papers about APM can be readily accessed within the esteemed academic publication Science Direct Publishers. These papers were also discovered within the repositories of esteemed publishers, namely Emerald and Taylor & Francis.

Despite some fluctuations, research on APM is increasing. In 2021, there were 20 scholarly papers dedicated to its exploring and analyzing APM, indicating a significant surge in discourse. The augmentation becomes even more conspicuous when utilizing a trend line to depict the data.

The study uses scholarly articles from 2013 to 2023, with diverse research methods. The paper is divided into three categories, as shown in Table 3.

The table shows that APM research primarily uses qualitative methods, with 51 papers analyzed. The second most common method is quantitative, used in approximately 35 papers, or around 30% of the total papers in study.

Based on Table 4, challenges in implementing APM have been classified into four categories: Customer-related challenges, Organizational challenges,

Publisher	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
Emerald	1		3	5	3		3	3	5	2	1	26
Inderscience				1		1	1			1		4
Sage		2			2	2		1	2			9
Science Direct	1	1	1	4	2		3	4	10	6	1	33
Taylor & Francis	1		2	2	2		5	2	3	4	2	23
Total	3	3	6	12	9	3	12	10	20	13	4	95

Table	2.	Publisher	data	used	for	the	paper
-------	----	-----------	------	------	-----	-----	-------

Table 3	; .	Used	metl	hodo	logies	in	the	studies
---------	------------	------	------	------	--------	----	-----	---------

Methodologies	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
Mix Method		1		3		1	1		1	1	1	9
Qualitative	1	1	5	4	5	1	9	6	11	6	2	51
Quantitative	2	1	1	5	4	1	2	4	8	6	1	35
Total	3	3	6	12	9	3	12	10	20	13	4	95

Category	Definition	References
Customer characteristic	Customer categories are related to the characteristics of the project's customers (Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015)	(Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015; Alhroub & Jaaron, 2019; Almeida et al., 2019; Alves & Gonçalves, 2022; Alzoubi et al., 2016; Conforto et al., 2014; Cram, 2019; de Borba et al., 2019; Inayat et al., 2015; Kasauli et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2021; Mansor et al., 2018; Radhakrishnan et al., 2021; Sheffield & Lemétayer, 2013; Shrivastava & Rathod, 2015; Sithambaram et al., 2021; Stankovic et al., 2013; Tam et al., 2020; Tsoy & Staples, 2021)
Organizational influences	Customer organization factor. Factors that are external to the project environment but originate from the parent organization and influence how the organization succeeds (Howell et al., 2010)	(Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015; Ahmed et al., 2021; Alhroub & Jaaron, 2019; Alsaqaf et al., 2019; Altuwaijri & Ferrario, 2022; Alzoubi et al., 2016; Annosi et al., 2020; Aoufi et al., 2021; Arefazar et al., 2022; Balve et al., 2017; Baxter & Turner, 2021; Bechtel et al., 2023; Bott & Mesmer, 2020; Brandl et al., 2021; Conforto et al., 2014, 2016; Cram, 2019; Cubric, 2013; Dikert et al., 2016; Fearne et al., 2021; Garcia et al., 2021; Gemino et al., 2020; Gregory et al., 2016; Gupta et al., 2019; Heeager & Nielsen, 2017; Hobbs, 2017; Hutter et al., 2020; Inayat et al., 2015; Islam & Storer, 2020; Jalali et al., 2014; Javed et al., 2021; Lospula et al., 2021; Kasauli et al., 2021; Koch & Schermuly, 2021; Kurniawan et al., 2021; Lappi et al., 2018; Lappi & Aaltonen, 2017; Lechler & Yang, 2017; Lee et al., 2021; Lehnen et al., 2016; Mansor et al., 2018; Manurung & Kurniawan, 2022; Marnada et al., 2021; Masood & Farooq, 2017; Medini, 2022; Raharjo & Purwandari, 2020; Saini et al., 2021; Salmm et al., 2021; Senabre Hidalgo, 2019; Serrador & Pinto, 2015; Sharma et al., 2022; Sheffield & Lemétayer, 2013; Shrivastava & Rathod, 2015; Sithambaram et al., 2021; Sreenivasan & Suresh, 2023; Srivastava & Jain, 2017; Stankovic et al., 2013; Stettina & Hörz, 2015; Stoddard et al., 2019; Tam et al., 2020; Taylor, 2016; Tsoy & Staples, 2021; Zakrzewska et al., 2022; Zasa et al., 2020; Zavyalova et al., 2020; Zielske & Held, 2022)
Project Management Methodology (PMM)	In the project category, the match between the characteristics, environment, and methodology of project management is defined as "fit". Therefore, the right methodology helps success in project work. (Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015)	(Agbejule & Lehtineva, 2022; Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015; Ahmed et al., 2021; Alhroub & Jaaron, 2019; Almeida et al., 2019; Alsaqaf et al., 2019; Altuwaijri & Ferrario, 2022; Alves & Gonçalves, 2022; Alzoubi et al., 2016; Annosi et al., 2020; Aoufi et al., 2021; Arefazar et al., 2022; Badakhshan et al., 2020; Baham et al., 2017; Bechtel et al., 2021; Bott & Mesmer, 2020; Brandl et al., 2021; Ciric Lalic et al., 2022; Conforto et al., 2014, 2016; Cooper & Sommer, 2020; Cram, 2019; Daneva et al., 2013; Dikert et al., 2016; F. Tripp & Armstrong, 2018; Fearne et al., 2021; Garcia et al., 2021; Gengory et al., 2016; Gupta et al., 2019; Heeager & Nielsen, 2017; Hobbs, 2017; Inayat et al., 2015; Islam & Storer, 2020; Jahr, 2014; Jalali et al., 2014; Josyula et al., 2021; Kadenic & Tambo, 2023; Kasauli et al., 2020; Lappi et al., 2018; Lechler & Yang, 2017; Lee et al., 2021; Lehnen et al., 2016; Lindsjørn et al., 2012; Mansor et al., 2021; Mansor et al., 2016; Patel & Poston, 2022; Marchwicka et al., 2021; Raharjo & Purwandari, 2020; Salman et al., 2021; Schmitt & Hörner, 2020; Senabre Hidalgo, 2019; Serrador & Pinto, 2015; Sharma et al., 2021; Sheriyasan & Suresh, 2023; Srivastava & Jain, 2017; Stankovic et al., 2013; Stettina & Hörz, 2015; Sun & Schmidt, 2018; Sweetman & Conboy, 2018; Tam et al., 2020; van Oorschot et al., 2016; Zurewska et al., 2022; Zielske & Held, 2021)
Team challenges	In the team category, it contains problems faced by the team during project work. The people who work in it are believed to have a positive impact on the success of the project. (Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015)	(Agbejule & Lehtineva, 2022; Ahimbisibwe et al., 2015; Ahmed et al., 2021; Alhroub & Jaaron, 2019; Almeida et al., 2019; Alsaqaf et al., 2019; Altuwaijri & Ferrario, 2022; Alves & Gonçalves, 2022; Alzoubi et al., 2016; Annosi et al., 2020; Aoufi et al., 2021; Arefazar et al., 2022; Azanha et al., 2017; Badakhshan et al., 2020; Brandl et al., 2021; Conforto et al., 2014, 2016; Cram, 2019; Cubric, 2013; Daneva et al., 2013; de Borba et al., 2019; Dikert et al., 2016; F. Tripp & Armstrong, 2018; Garcia et al., 2021; Gemino et al., 2020; Heeager & Nielsen, 2017; Hobbs, 2017; Islam & Storer, 2020; Jalali et al., 2014; Javed et al., 2021; Josyula et al., 2021; Kadenic & Tambo, 2023; Kahl et al., 2022; Kasauli et al., 2018; Lappi & Aaltonen, 2017; Lechler & Yang, 2017; Lee et al., 2021; Mansor et al., 2016; Lindsjørn et al., 2016; Lindskog & Netz, 2021; Malik et al., 2021; Marnada et al., 2016; Lindsjørn et al., 2012; Marchwicka et al., 2022; Mardari et al., 2016; Diszewska et al., 2016; Patel & Poston, 2022; Radhakrishnan et al., 2021; Raharjo & Purwandari, 2020; Saini et al., 2018; Salman et al., 2021; Scheffield & Lemétayer, 2013; Shrivastava & Rathod, 2015; Sithambaram et al., 2021; Stodard et al., 2023; Sirvastava & Jain, 2017; Stankovic et al., 2013; Stettina & Hörz, 2015; Stodard et al., 2021; van Oorschot et al., 2018; Zakrzewska et al., 2022; Zasa et al., 2021; van Oorschot et al., 2018; Carrzewska et al., 2022; Zasa et al., 2021; Vardiar et al., 2016; Casavalova et al., 2022; Zasa et al., 2015; Zavyalova et al., 2020; Zielske & Held, 2021)

Table 4. Definition	of	the	category
---------------------	----	-----	----------

PMM challenges, and challenges associated with the team involved in the implementation process. These categories encompass the various components of implementing APM. APM methodology focuses on meeting diverse needs of customers. Eighteen scholarly journals delve into the intricacies of customer characteristics and their feedback for product development. In the organizational category, there are 65 scholarly journals about various aspects such as culture, stakeholders, planning, vision, and mission, which can significantly impact project success. It is important to use a methodology that can adapt to unique characteristics, environmental factors, and chosen approach. There are 72 scholarly journals that explore project execution and management methodologies. The team category identifies individuals directly involved in the project. There are 76 scholarly journals that delve into the subject matter of the team that is slated to engage directly in the execution of the project.

Table 5 shows that in 2021, there are 188 distinct factor categories, with the team factor being the most common at 72. After the team factor, there are organizational, customer and PMM categories with 63, 48, and 5 factors respectively. In 2022, there will be 78 factors, with the PMM category having the most at 30 factors. The team, organizational, and customer categories follow closely behind with 26, 19, and 5 factors respectively. In 2019, there were 77-factor types, with the PMM category had 26 points, while teams, organizations, and customers had 25, 20, and 6 points respectively in their respective categories.

Based on the analysis of the 95 papers, it can be observed from the findings presented in Table 4 that the team category substantially impacts the challenges associated with the implementation of APM. Specifically, it emerges as the second most prominent and influential category in this context.

Table 6 shows 10 factors including commitment, capability, coordination, experience, ability, collaboration, composition, characteristics, communication, and knowledge pose significant challenges in implementing APM, with knowledge being the primary hurdle.

In addition, there are a total of 27 communication factors and 25 characteristics. The timeless nature of knowledge and communication becomes clear in the context of APM, as these two factors play a central role in team collaboration. The complexity of APM knowledge poses challenges for effective communication between team, creating an ongoing cycle between the two. Such an event will undoubtedly have an impact on subsequent variables.

Knowledge is a team's challenge when implementing APM. This challenge factor arises because this knowledge is caused by a lack of understanding of agile, inability to adopt agile mindset, lack of literature guidance, and interpretation of agile differences between teams. With these different perceptions on Agile, challenges in this knowledge have a high point or are more often encountered in groups. The reason for this difference in perception is the need for stakeholders to discuss changes in method with the team. In addition, the absence of training makes it challenging to apply Agile to a project. This unfamiliar method makes the team

Table 5. The total factors from the category throughout the

Catagoria	Years												
Category	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total	
Customer Characteristic	2		7	3		1	6	2	5	3		29	
Organizational Influences	4	4	14	12	15	8	20	11	48	19	6	161	
Team Challenges	8	6	20	24	26	5	25	21	72	26	8	241	
PM Methodology	10	8	28	19	14	18	26	22	63	30	8	246	
Total	24	18	69	58	55	32	77	56	188	78	22	677	

uncomfortable so those directly involved force the team to return to the previous form.

In addition, there is a network analysis of the Team category, which has a key paper entitled "A contingency fit model of critical success factors for software development projects: A comparison of agile and traditional plan-based methodologies," based on network analysis some papers are connected to key papers such as Conforto et al., 2016; Sheffield & Lemétayer, 2013; Tsoy & Staples, 2021.

Second place goes to PMM with 153 factors. Table 7 shows ten main characteristics that make APM implementation challenging in this category. Adaptation, cost, time, process, schedule, performance, tools, technology, requirements, and agile methods are listed. Table 7 shows that the process APM imple-

2019

Factors						Years						Total
Factors	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
Team Capability	1			1	2			3		1	1	9
Team Coordination			2	2			1	1	2	1		9
Team Experience		1	2	1					4		1	9
Team Commitment	1		2		1			2	2	2		10
Team Skills			1	2	2		1		4	1		11
Team Collaboration		1	1	1	2		1	1	4	2		13
Team Composition	2	1	2	2	1		1		6	1		16
Team Characteristics	1	1	1	3			3	4	10	1	1	25
Team Communication			2	2	5	2	2	1	8	4	1	27
Team Knowledge		1	1	2	4	1	6	4	9	3	2	33
Total	5	5	14	16	17	3	15	16	49	16	6	162

Table 6. Determinant factor in team category



Figure 2. Network analysis in team category

Factors						Years						Tatal
Factors	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
PM Schedule	1		1	1	1	1	1	2		2		10
PM Flexibility			1		1	1	1	1		4	2	11
PM Support			2		1	1		2	3		2	11
PM Time			1	1	1	2	2	1	2		2	12
PM Performance	1			1	1		2	1	3	4	1	14
PM Agile practices	1		2		3		2	2	5	2	1	18
PM Requirements	1	1	2		2	1	2	1	4	3	1	18
PM Technology	2	1	2		1		2	2	4	3	1	18
PM Tools	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	5		3	18
PM Process		1		5	2	2	3	1	7	1	1	23
Total	7	5	17	11	6	11	17	13	39	20	7	153

Table 7. Determinant factor in PM methodology category



Figure 3. Network analysis in PM category

mentation difficulty score among the project category is the highest, with a cumulative score of 23 points. After applying agile techniques, requirements, tools, and technology must be considered. Each element is worth 18 points, giving each category 18 points. The project are affected by the processes. APM's flexibility makes implementation challenging for organizations that need help adapting to its dynamic nature.

The "process category" in APM implementation is strong because many teams lack agile skills, lack

flexibility or inconsistency, lack of hybrid-methods to match the details of the practice, mismatch between

agile and traditional methods, management unwilling to change, and customize agile poorly. These considerations

Factors						Years						– Total
1 actors	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
Organizational Composition				1		1	1		2			5
Organizational Environment								1	1	2	1	5
Organizational Objective			1						4			5
Organizational Performance					1		1	1	2			5
Organizational Vision & Mission			2						3		1	6
Organizational Leadership			1		2		1		3		1	8
Organizational Monitoring & Controlling			1		2	1	1		2	1		8
Organizational Motivation					3		2		3	1		9
Organizational Planning		1	2	1	1		1		3	1		10
Organization		1		1	1	1	1	1	5	2		13
Organizational Stakeholder	1		3			1	2	1	6	3	1	18
Organizational Culture	2	1	1	1	2	2	4	2	6	6		27
Total	3	3	11	4	12	6	14	6	40	16	4	119

Table 8. Determinant factor in organizational category



Figure 4. Network analysis in organizational category

make project APM implementation difficult. Many businesses are rigid. For instance, they resist change. Problems like that hinder agile methods. Agile methodologies can alter numerous management responsibilities.

The PMM category has a key paper titled "The relationship between traditional project management, agile project management and teamwork quality on project success", and network analysis shows that some papers are linked to key papers like Conforto et al., 2016; Hobbs, 2017; Lee et al., 2021.

Table 8 illustrates the primary factors that present challenges in implementing APM within the organizational category: culture, stakeholders, and organization. These three factors exhibit significant numerical values, particularly culture.

The cultural factor is assigned a significantly high value of 27, followed by stakeholders and organizations with scores of 18 and 13, respectively. Undoubtedly, the implementation of APM is profoundly influenced by culture, as cultural disparities can be perceived as variations in an individual's mindset or perspective toward a given matter.

Cultural factors become very dominant because the culture in an organization determines the performance of the company and each individual. Leadership, trust, and environment are some examples of organizational culture. Suppose an organization doesn't have better leadership, low trust for individuals, a bad environment, and individual relationships that are not harmonious. In that case, it will be challenging to implement APM in an organization, especially since APM is very flexible to change. That way, organizational culture plays a vital role in the success of APM applications.

The effectiveness of APM implementation is mutually sustainable for both stakeholders and organizations. The reason behind this phenomenon lies in the impact exerted by stakeholders on an organization, which subsequently shapes how it executes its activities.

There is a network analysis in the Organizational category where in this category the critical paper is, Does Agile Work? - A quantitative analysis of the success of agile projects. Based on network analysis, several papers are connected to the core paper, such as Bergmann & Karwowski, 2019; Sheffield & Lemétayer, 2013.

According to the data presented in Table 9, it can be observed that the primary determinants impacting the efficacy of APM implementation are situated within the support domain. This customer segment is generally influenced by four primary factors: support, participation, collaboration, and the

Factors		Years										T-4-1
		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	- rotar
Customer Characteristics									1			1
Customer Commitment							1					1
Customer Communication				1								1
Customer Knowledge									1			1
Customer Product			1									1
Customer Resources			1									1
Customer Satisfaction							1					1
Customer			1							1		2
Customer Collaboration							1		1	1		3
Customer Participant			2			1	1		1			5
Customer Support	2		2	1			2	2	1	1		11
Total	2	0	7	2	0	1	6	2	5	3	0	28

Table 9. Determinant fac	tor in customer category
--------------------------	--------------------------

customer.

Based on the available evidence, the remaining factors do not substantially impact the efficacy of APM implementation. Based on the data presented in Table 9, it is evident that the aspects of satisfaction, resources, product, knowledge, communication, commitment, and characteristics all receive a score of 1 for each respective factor.

In contrast to the support factor, which receives 11 points, the participant and collaboration factors are awarded 5 and 3 points, respectively. The primary determinant for customers can be inferred to be support. The support factor is a challenge that many practitioners face when dealing with customers or clients. Lack of support in the form of communication and knowledge about APM to customers or clients can result in miscommunication. Also, the need for more information to customers or clients about APM can make customers less supportive of APM practitioners in implementing APM. Therefore, APM practitioners should provide support through communication and knowledge to customers to facilitate the successful use of the APM method.

There is a network analysis in the customer category. The key paper is "The impact of project



Figure 5. Network analysis in customer category

Table	e 10.	Consolidated	factors	from	all	categories
-------	-------	--------------	---------	------	-----	------------

Factors	Years											Total
Factors		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	· Totai
Communication			2	3	5	2	2	1	9	4	1	29
Support	2	1	4	5		1	5	3	7	3		31
Characteristics	1	1	1	4		1	4	6	13	2	1	34
Culture	4	1	1	2	3	2	4	2	9	8		36
Knowledge		1	1	3	5	1	7	5	13	4	2	42
Total	7	4	9	17	13	7	22	17	51	21	4	172

team characteristics and client collaboration on project agility and project success: An empirical study". Based on the network analysis, several papers are connected to the key article, such as Alzoubi et al., 2016; Cram, 2019; Lee et al., 2021.

Table 10 shows that 2021 has the highest cumulative factor count, 51 points. Knowledge and qualities had the most concerns that year, 13 points. Knowledge and traits are interdependent in their sustainability. Specific person attributes can improve organizational knowledge distribution. Communication, support, characteristics, culture, and knowledge are the biggest APM implementation hurdles. The five elements with the most weight receive 42 points, demonstrating the value of knowledge. Culture, traits, support, and communication have 36, 34, 31, and 29 points.

Ignorance about the APM method makes deploying agile in a team or organization difficult. This hinders agile implementation. This issue may also arise from company training needs. This also affects culture, traits, support, and communication. Organizational culture and traits affect team knowledge. Tables 5 and 7 reveal that an organization's culture comes first and team qualities come third, with a little difference in points. Other aspects also influence the APM technique, with support ranking first in the customer category and communication ranking second in the team category. Since these five criteria are related and durable, this APM approach can work.

V. Conclusions

A global APM implementation effectiveness systematic literature review (SLR) is presented here. The SLR analyzes and interprets APM research. The study found 677 consumer, organizational, team, and PMM aspects. PMM accumulates the most points due to its methodology. Companies may struggle to adopt new methods.

Second is team, where knowledge gain affects effectiveness. Project execution requires shared

knowledge. Culture greatly affects APM execution and individual viewpoints in organizational dynamics. Customer assistance is essential for project progress.

Knowledge, culture, characteristics, support, and communication greatly impact APM adoption effectiveness. Understanding agile technique and switching from waterfall are challenges. Being second in significance, culture makes dealing with uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity difficult.

Human nature's traits make managing varied teams difficult. Financial and motivational support are essential. Language, cultural, and time zone differences make communication difficult. Lack of team trust inhibits APM implementation. Teamwork requires upper-level management trust in flexible systems.

References

- Agbejule, A., & Lehtineva, L. (2022). The relationship between traditional project management, agile project management and teamwork quality on project success. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 30(7), 124-136. doi:10.1108/IJOA-02-2022-3149
- Ahimbisibwe, A., Cavana, R. Y., & Daellenbach, U. (2015). A contingency fit model of critical success factors for software development projects: A comparison of agile and traditional plan-based methodologies. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 28(1), 7-33. doi: 10.1108/JEIM-08-2013-0060
- Ahmed, R., Philbin, S. P., & Cheema, F. e. A. (2021). Systematic literature review of project manager's leadership competencies. *Engineering, construction and architectural management, 28*(1), 1-30. doi:10.1108/ECAM-05-2019-0276
- Alamsjah, F. (2022). Ambidextrous leadership of publicly listed companies during turbulent times: The importance of agility and alliance capability. *Global Business and Finance Review*, 27(3), 41-55. doi:10.17549/gbfr.2022.27. 3.41
- Almeida, F., Miranda, E., & Falcão, J. (2019). Challenges and facilitators practices for knowledge management in large-scale scrum teams. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 21(2), 90-102.
- Almeida, F., Miranda, E., & Falcão, J. (2019). Challenges and facilitators practices for knowledge management in large-scale scrum teams. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 21(2), 90-102. doi: 10.1080/15228053.2019.1637087

- Alsaqaf, W., Daneva, M., & Wieringa, R. (2019). Quality requirements challenges in the context of large-scale distributed agile: An empirical study. *Information and Software Technology*, 110, 39-55. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.2019.01.009
- Altuwaijri, F. S., & Ferrario, M. A. (2022). Factors affecting Agile adoption: An industry research study of the mobile app sector in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 190. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2022.111347
- Alves, E. J., & Gonçalves, C. A. (2023). Agile project portfolio management as a strategic enabler in the Brazilian marketplace: five case studies and one substantive theory. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 16(3), 475-495.
- Alzoubi, Y. I., Gill, A. Q., & Al-Ani, A. (2016). Empirical studies of geographically distributed agile development communication challenges: A systematic review. *Information* and Management, 53(1), 22-37. doi:10.1016/j.im.2015.08.003
- Annosi, M. C., Martini, A., Brunetta, F., & Marchegiani, L. (2020). Learning in an agile setting: A multilevel research study on the evolution of organizational routines. *Journal of Business Research*, 110, 554-566. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.011
- Aoufi, A., Schoeman, M., & Turner, N. (2021). How to outsource agile projects effectively: Suppliers and client advisors need to work closely with client organizations to ensure key enablers are in place to increase success when outsourcing agile projects. *Research Technology Management*, 65(1), 59-66. doi:10.1080/08956308.2022.1 987792
- Arefazar, Y., Nazari, A., Hafezi, M. R., & Maghool, S. A. H. (2022). Prioritizing agile project management strategies as a change management tool in construction projects. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 22(4), 678-689. doi:10.1080/15623599.2019.1644757
- Azanha, A., Argoud, A. R. T. T., de Camargo Junior, J. B., & Antoniolli, P. D. (2017). Agile project management with Scrum: A case study of a Brazilian pharmaceutical company IT project. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 10*(1), 121-142. doi:10.1108/IJMPB-06-2016-0054
- Badakhshan, P., Conboy, K., Grisold, T., & vom Brocke, J. (2020). Agile business process management: A systematic literature review and an integrated framework. *Business Process Management Journal*, 26(6), 1505-1523. doi: 10.1108/BPMJ-12-2018-0347
- Baham, C., Hirschheim, R., Calderon, A. A., & Kisekka, V. (2017). An agile methodology for the disaster recovery of information systems under Catastrophic scenarios. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 34(3), 633-663. doi:10.1080/07421222.2017.1372996
- Baik, Y., & Kang, J. (2020). Small knowledge-intensive firms' innovation and performance: The moderating effects of organizational change. *Global Business and Finance Review*, 25(2), 51-63. doi:10.17549/gbfr.2020.25.2.51
- Balve, P., Krüger, V., & Tolstrup Sørensen, L. (2017). Applying the Kanban method in problem-based project work: A case study in a manufacturing engineering

bachelor's programme at Aalborg University Copenhagen. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 42(6), 1512-1530. doi:10.1080/03043797.2017.1350143

- Baxter, D., & Turner, N. (2023). Why Scrum works in new product development: the role of social capital in managing complexity. *Production Planning & Control*, 34(13), 1248-1260.
- Bechtel, J., Kaufmann, C., & Kock, A. (2023). The interplay between dynamic capabilities' dimensions and their relationship to project portfolio agility and success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 41(4), 102469. doi:10.1016/J.IJPROMAN.2023.102469
- Bergmann, T., & Karwowski, W. (2019). Agile project management and project success: A literature review. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, 783, 405-414. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-94709-9 39
- Bott, M., & Mesmer, B. (2020). An analysis of theories supporting agile scrum and the use of scrum in systems engineering. *EMJ - Engineering Management Journal*, 32(2), 76-85. doi:10.1080/10429247.2019.1659701
- Brandl, F. J., Roider, N., Hehl, M., & Reinhart, G. (2021). Selecting practices in complex technical planning projects: A pathway for tailoring agile project management into the manufacturing industry. *CIRP Journal of Manufacturing Science and Technology*, 33, 293-305. doi:10.1016/j.cirpj. 2021.03.017
- Choi, S. B., & Jeong, J. G. (2022). A multilevel study of the relationship between leader agreeable communication style and team creativity: Knowledge sharing as mediator and knowledge ownership as moderator. *Global Business and Finance Review*, 27(4), 27-45. doi:10.17549/gbfr.202 2.27.4.27
- Ciric Lalic, D., Lalic, B., Delić, M., Gracanin, D., & Stefanovic, D. (2022). How project management approach impact project success? From traditional to agile. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 15(3), 494-521. doi:10.1108/IJMPB-04-2021-0108
- Collignon, S. E., Nazir, S., & Surendra, N. C. (2022). Agile systems development: Privacy theoretical lens to challenge the full information disclosure paradigm. *Information & Management*, 59(6), 103679. doi:10.1016/j.im.2022.103679
- Conforto, E. C., Amaral, D. C., da Silva, S. L., Di Felippo, A., & Kamikawachi, D. S. L. (2016). The agility construct on project management theory. *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(4), 660-674. doi:10.1016/j.ijpro man.2016.01.007
- Conforto, E. C., Salum, F., Amaral, D. C., Da Silva, S. L., & De Almeida, L. F. M. (2014). Can agile project management be adopted by industries other than software development? *Project Management Journal*, 45(3), 21-34. doi:10.1002/pmj.21410
- Cooper, R. G., & Sommer, A. F. (2020). New-product portfolio management with agile: Challenges and solutions for manufacturers using agile development methods. *Research Technology Management*, 63(1), 29-38. doi:10.1080/0895 6308.2020.1686291

- Cram, W. A. (2019). Agile development in practice: Lessons from the trenches. *Information Systems Management*, 36(1), 2-14. doi:10.1080/10580530.2018.1553645
- Cubric, M. (2013). An agile method for teaching agile in business schools. *International Journal of Management Education*, 11(3), 119-131. doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2013.10.001
- Daneva, M., Van Der Veen, E., Amrit, C., Ghaisas, S., Sikkel, K., Kumar, R., ... Wieringa, R. (2013). Agile requirements prioritization in large-scale outsourced system projects: An empirical study. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 86(5), 1333-1353. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2012.12.046
- de Borba, J. C. R., Trabasso, L. G., & Pessôa, M. V. P. (2019). Agile management in product development. *Research Technology Management*, 62(5), 63-67. doi: 10.1080/08956308.2019.1638488
- Dikert, K., Paasivaara, M., & Lassenius, C. (2016). Challenges and success factors for large-scale agile transformations: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 119, 87-108. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2016.06.013
- Dingsøyr, T., Moe, N. B., & Seim, E. A. (2018). Coordinating knowledge work in multiteam programs: Findings from a large-scale agile development program. *Project Management Journal*, 49(6), 64-77. doi:10.1177/8756972818798980
- Edkins, A., Geraldi, J., Morris, P., & Smith, A. (2013). Exploring the front-end of project management. *Engineering Project Organization Journal*, 3(2), 71-85. doi:10.1080/21573727. 2013.775942
- F. Tripp, J., & Armstrong, D. J. (2018). Agile methodologies: organizational adoption motives, tailoring, and performance. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 58(2), 170-179. doi:10.1080/08874417.2016.1220240
- Fearne, A., Wagner, B., McDougall, N., & Loseby, D. (2021). The power of purpose - lessons in agility from the ventilator challenge. *Supply Chain Management*, 26(6), 753-766. doi:10.1108/SCM-09-2020-0468
- Garcia, V. M. B., Martens, C. D. P., Carvalho, R. B., & Martens, M. L. (2021). Contributions of entrepreneurial orientation in the use of agile methods in project management. *Innovation and Management Review*, 18(1), 17-33. doi:10.1108/INMR-01-2019-0002
- Gemino, A., Horner Reich, B., & Serrador, P. M. (2021). Agile, traditional, and hybrid approaches to project success: is hybrid a poor second choice? *Project Management Journal*, 52(2), 161-175. https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972 820973082
- Gregory, P., Barroca, L., Sharp, H., Deshpande, A., & Taylor, K. (2016). The challenges that challenge: Engaging with agile practitioners' concerns. *Information and Software Technology*, 77, 92-104. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.2016.04.006
- Gupta, S., Kumar, S., Kamboj, S., Bhushan, B., & Luo, Z. (2019). Impact of IS agility and HR systems on job satisfaction: an organizational information processing theory perspective. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(9), 1782-1805. doi:10.1108/JKM-07-2018-0466
- Heeager, L. T., & Nielsen, P. A. (2017). Intrafirm knowledge transfer of agile software practices: barriers and their relations.

Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research, 19(4), 199-224. doi:10.1080/15228053.2017.14 13873

- Hobbs, B. (2017). Agile methods on large projects in large organizations. Project Management Journal 3 Project Management Journal, 48(3). doi:10.1177/875697281704 800301
- Howell, D., Windahl, C., & Seidel, R. (2010). A project contingency framework based on uncertainty and its consequences. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(3), 256-264. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.06.002
- Hutter, K., Brendgens, F.-M., Gauster, S. P., & Matzler, K. (2023). Scaling organizational agility: Key insights from an incumbent firm's agile transformation. Management Decision. doi:10.1108/md-05-2022-0650
- Ichsan, M., & Soebandrija, K. (2021). Bab 14 Project Management. In *Manajemen: Teori dan Perkembangannya*. https://journals.sagepub.com/home/pmx
- Inayat, I., Salim, S. S., Marczak, S., Daneva, M., & Shamshirband, S. (2015). A systematic literature review on agile requirements engineering practices and challenges. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 51, 915-929. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2014.10.046
- Islam, G., & Storer, T. (2020). A case study of agile software development for safety-critical systems projects. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 200. doi:10.1016/j.ress.20 20.106954
- Ismail, S. N., Ramli, A., & Aziz, H. A. (2021). Influencing factors on safety culture in mining industry: A systematic literature review approach. *Resources Policy*, 74. doi:10.1016/j.resourpol.2021.102250
- Jahr, M. (2014). A hybrid approach to quantitative software project scheduling within agile frameworks. *Project Management Journal*, 45(3), 35-45. doi:10.1002/pmj.21411
- Jalali, S., Wohlin, C., & Angelis, L. (2014). Investigating the applicability of Agility assessment surveys: A case study. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 98, 172-190. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2014.08.067
- Javed, S., Bamford, J., & Abualqumboz, M. (2021). Helping deluxe Beds to sleep easy: A case study of agile project management. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship* and Innovation, 22(2), 132-139. doi:10.1177/1465750320 974942
- Josyula, S. S., Suresh, M., & Raghu Raman, R. (2021). How to make intelligent automation projects agile? Identification of success factors and an assessment approach. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 31(5). doi:10.1108/IJOA-05-2021-2749
- Kadenic, M. D., & Tambo, T. (2023). Resilience of operating models: Exploring the potential of agile project management as enabler. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 16(3). doi:10.1108/IJMPB-05-2022-0122
- Kahl, J., de Klerk, S., & Ogulin, R. (2022). Agile strategies for middle managers. *Management Decision*, 60(1), 146-166. doi:10.1108/MD-07-2020-0889
- Kasauli, R., Knauss, E., Horkoff, J., Liebel, G., & de Oliveira

Neto, F. G. (2021). Requirements engineering challenges and practices in large-scale agile system development. *Journal of Systems and Software, 172.* doi:10.1016/j.jss.20 20.110851

- Kasinath, H. M. (2013). Understanding and using qualitative methods in performance measurement. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(1), 46-57.
- Kaufmann, C., Kock, A., & Gemünden, H. G. (2020). Emerging strategy recognition in agile portfolios. *International Journal of Project Management*, 38(7), 429-440. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2020.01.002
- Koch, J., & Schermuly, C. C. (2021). Who is attracted and why? How agile project management influences employee's attraction and commitment. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 14(3), 699-720. doi:10.1108/IJMPB-02-2020-0063
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fie an integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1-49. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x
- Kumar, D., & Govender, I. (2016). Bringing agile practice to the classroom: Student voices of third-year major project implementation. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development, 8*(5-6), 423-428. doi: 10.1080/20421338.2016.1219502
- Kurniawan, R., Budiastuti, D., Hamsal, M., & Kosasih, W. (2020). The impact of balanced agile project management on firm performance: the mediating role of market orientation and strategic agility. *Review of International Business and Strategy*, 30(4), 457-490. doi:10.1108/RIBS-03-2020-0022
- Kurniawan, R., Manurung, A. H., Hamsal, M., & Kosasih, W. (2021). Orchestrating internal and external resources to achieve agility and performance: The centrality of market orientation. *Benchmarking*, 28(2), 517-555. doi:10.1108/B IJ-05-2020-0229
- Lappi, T., & Aaltonen, K. (2017). Project governance in public sector agile software projects. *International Journal* of Managing Projects in Business, 10(2), 263-294. doi: 10.1108/IJMPB-04-2016-0031
- Lappi, T., Karvonen, T., Lwakatare, L. E., Aaltonen, K., & Kuvaja, P. (2018). Toward an improved understanding of agile project governance: A systematic literature review. *Project Management Journal*, 49(6), 39-63. doi:10.1177/8 756972818803482
- Lechler, T. G., & Yang, S. (2017). Exploring the role of project management in the development of the academic agile software discourse: A bibliometric analysis. *Project Management Journal 3 Project Management Journal*, 48(1). doi:10.1177/875697281704800101
- Lee, H. K., Deng, T., & Sarkar, S. (2021). Developing CRMSys at SoftTel: Traditional or agile? *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 23(4), 279-302. doi:10.1080/15228053.2021.1923317
- Lehnen, J., Schmidt, T. S., & Herstatt, C. (2016). Bringing agile project management into lead user projects. Int. J.

Product Development, 21(3). doi:10.1504/IJPD.2016.078867

- 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. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2016.09.028
- Lindskog, C., & Netz, J. (2021). Balancing between stability and change in Agile teams. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 14(7), 1529-1554. doi:10.1108/IJMPB-12-2020-0366
- Malik, M., Sarwar, S., & Orr, S. (2021). Agile practices and performance: Examining the role of psychological empowerment. *International Journal of Project Management*, 39(1), 10-20. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2020.09.002
- Mansor, Z., Arshad, N. H., Yahya, S., & Letchmunan, S. (2018). Validated agile cost management success factors in software development projects. *Int. J. Advanced Intelligence Paradigms*, 11(2), 5-18.
- Manurung, A. H., & Kurniawan, R. (2022). Organizational agility: do agile project management and networking capability require market orientation? *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 15(1), 1-35. doi:10.1108/IJMPB-10-2020-0310
- Marchwicka, E., Tusz, P., & Betta, J. (2022). Adopting scrum methodology in the project of organising a concert. *Int.* J. Project Organisation and Management, 14(1), 1-19.
- Marder, B., Ferguson, P., Marchant, C., Brennan, M., Hedler, C., Rossi, M., Black, S., & Doig, R. (2021). 'Going agile': Exploring the use of project management tools in fostering psychological safety in group work within management discipline courses. *International Journal of Management Education*, 19(3). doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100519
- Marnada, P., Raharjo, T., Hardian, B., & Prasetyo, A. (2021). Agile project management challenge in handling scope and change: A systematic literature review. *Procedia Computer Science*, 197, 290-300. doi:10.1016/j.procs.202 1.12.143
- Masood, Z. A., & Farooq, S. (2017). The benefits and key challenges of agile project management under recent research opportunities the benefits and key challenges of agile project management under recent research opportunities view project. *International Research Journal of Management Science*, 5(1), 20-28. http://www.irjmsjournal.com
- Medini, K. (2022). A framework for agility improvement projects in the post mass customisation era. *International Journal of Production Research*, 61(20), 7105-7121. doi:10.1080/00207543.2022.2146228
- Nicholls, G. M., Lewis, N. A., & Eschenbach, T. (2015). Determining when simplified Agile project management is right for small teams. *EMJ - Engineering Management Journal*, 27(1), 3-10. doi:10.1080/10429247.2015.11432031
- Nurdiani, I., Börstler, J., & Fricker, S. A. (2016). The impacts of agile and lean practices on project constraints: A tertiary study. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 119, 162-183. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2016.06.043
- Olszewska, M., Heidenberg, J., Weijola, M., Mikkonen, K.,

& Porres, I. (2016). Quantitatively measuring a large-scale agile transformation. *Journal of Systems and Software, 117*, 258-273. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2016.03.029

- Patel, J., & Poston, R. (2022). Using social intelligence to overcome agile adoption challenges. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 62(4), 740-751. doi:10.1080/088744 17.2021.1913670
- Pati, D., & Lorusso, L. N. (2018). How to write a systematic review of the literature. *Health Environments Research* and Design Journal, 11(1), 15-30. doi:10.1177/193758671 7747384
- Radhakrishnan, A., Zaveri, J., David, D., & Davis, J. S. (2021). The impact of project team characteristics and client collaboration on project agility and project success: An empirical study. *European Management Journal*, 40(5), 758-777. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2021.09.011
- Raharjo, T., & Purwandari, B. (2020). Agile project management challenges and mapping solutions: A systematic literature review. ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, 123-129. doi:10.1145/3378936.3378949
- Saini, M., Arif, M., & Kulonda, D. J. (2018). Critical factors for transferring and sharing tacit knowledge within lean and agile construction processes. *Construction Innovation*, 18(1), 64-89. doi:10.1108/CI-06-2016-0036
- Salman, A., Jaafar, M., Malik, S., Mohammad, D., & Muhammad, S. A. (2021). An empirical investigation of the impact of the communication and employee motivation on the project success using agile framework and its effect on the software development business. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 9(1), 46-61. doi:10.1177/2278533720902915
- Schmitt, A., & Hörner, S. (2020). Systematic literature review - improving business processes by implementing agile. *Business Process Management Journal*, 27(3), 868-882. doi:10.1108/BPMJ-10-2019-0422
- Senabre Hidalgo, E. (2019). Adapting the scrum framework for agile project management in science: Case study of a distributed research initiative. *Heliyon*, 5(3), e01447. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2019
- Serrador, P., & Pinto, J. K. (2015). Does agile work? A quantitative analysis of agile project success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(5), 1040-1051. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.01.006
- Sharma, M., Luthra, S., Joshi, S., & Joshi, H. (2022). Challenges to agile project management during COVID-19 pandemic: An emerging economy perspective. *Operations Management Research*, 15(1-2), 461-474. doi:10.1007/s12063-021-002 49-1
- Sheffield, J., & Lemétayer, J. (2013). Factors associated with the software development agility of successful projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(3), 459-472. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2012.09.011
- Shrivastava, S. V., & Rathod, U. (2015). Categorization of risk factors for distributed agile projects. *Information and Software Technology*, 58, 373-387. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.20 14.07.007
- Sithambaram, J., Nasir, M. H. N. B. M., & Ahmad, R. (2021).

Issues and challenges impacting the successful management of agile-hybrid projects: A grounded theory approach. *International Journal of Project Management*, 39(5), 474-495. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2021.03.002

- Sreenivasan, A., & Suresh, M. (2023). Agile readiness for sustainable operations in start-ups. *International Journal* of Innovation Science, 16(1). doi:10.1108/IJIS-08-2022-0164
- Srivastava, P., & Jain, S. (2017). A leadership framework for distributed self-organized scrum teams. *Team Performance Management*, 23(5-6), 293-314. doi:10.1108/TPM-06-201 6-0033
- Stankovic, D., Nikolic, V., Djordjevic, M., & Cao, D. B. (2013). A survey study of critical success factors in agile software projects in former Yugoslavia IT companies. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 86(6), 1663-1678. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2013.02.027
- Stettina, C. J., & Hörz, J. (2015). Agile portfolio management: An empirical perspective on the practice in use. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(1), 140-152. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.03.008
- Stoddard, M. M., Gillis, B., & Cohn, P. (2019). Agile project management in libraries: Creating collaborative, resilient, responsive organizations. *Journal of Library Administration*, 59(5), 492-511. doi:10.1080/01930826.2019.1616971
- Stormi, K. T., Laine, T., & Korhonen, T. (2019). Agile performance measurement system development: An answer to the need for adaptability? *Journal of Accounting* and Organizational Change, 15(2), 231-256. doi: 10.1108/JAOC-09-2017-0076
- Sun, W., & Schmidt, C. (2018). Control mechanisms and agile methodology use: Data from the industry. *Journal* of Computer Information Systems, 58(3), 234-243. doi: 10.1080/08874417.2016.1232999
- Sweetman, R., & Conboy, K. (2018). Portfolios of agile projects: A complex adaptive systems' agent perspective. *Project Management Journal*, 49(6), 18-38. doi:10.1177/8 756972818802712
- Tam, C., Moura, E. J. da C., Oliveira, T., & Varajão, J. (2020). The factors influencing the success of on-going agile software development projects. *International Journal* of Project Management, 38(3), 165-176. doi:10.1016/j.ijpr oman.2020.02.001
- Taylor, K. J. (2016). Adopting agile software development: The project manager experience. *Information Technology* and People, 29(4), 670-687. doi:10.1108/ITP-02-2014-0031
- Teece', D. J., Pisan02, G., & Shuen3, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.
- Tsoy, M., & Staples, D. S. (2021). What are the critical success factors for agile analytics projects? *Information Systems Management*, 38(4), 324-341. doi:10.1080/10580 530.2020.1818899
- van Oorschot, K. E., Sengupta, K., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2018). Under pressure: The effects of iteration lengths on agile software development performance. *Project Management Journal*, 49(6), 78-102. doi:10.1177/875697

2818802714

- Zakrzewska, M., Jarosz, S., Piwowar-Sulej, K., & Sołtysik, M. (2022). Enterprise agility - its meaning, managerial expectations and barriers to implementation - a survey of three countries. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 35(3), 488-510. doi:10.1108/JOCM-02-202 1-0061
- Zasa, F. P., Patrucco, A., & Pellizzoni, E. (2020). Managing the hybrid organization: How can agile and traditional project management coexist? *Research Technology Management*, 64(1), 54-63. doi:10.1080/08956308.2021.1843331

Zavyalova, E., Sokolov, D., & Lisovskaya, A. (2020). Agile

vs traditional project management approaches: Comparing human resource management architectures. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28(5), 1095-1112. doi:10.1108/IJOA-08-2019-1857

- Zielske, M., & Held, T. (2021). Application of agile methods in traditional logistics companies and logistics startups: Results from a German delphi study. *Journal of Systems* and Software, 177, 110950. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2021.110950
- Zielske, M., & Held, T. (2022). Agile methods used by traditional logistics companies and logistics start-ups: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 190, 111328. doi:10.1016/J.JSS.2022.111328