

## THE MODERATING ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL AGILITY IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PLANNING QUALITY AND PROJECT DELIVERY PERFORMANCE

Dr. Muhammad Imran Majeed<sup>\*1</sup>, Dr. Sahar Munir<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Abdullah Hammad<sup>3</sup>,  
Muhammad Soban Ilyas<sup>4</sup>, Areen Fatima<sup>5</sup>, Nida Maqsood<sup>6</sup>

<sup>\*1,3</sup>Assistant Professor NBS, The University of Faisalabad.

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor IBMS, Uni. of Agriculture Faisalabad.

<sup>4,5,6</sup>MS Project Management Students, The University of Faisalabad.

<sup>1</sup>imranmajeed.nbs@tuf.edu.pk, <sup>2</sup>Sahar.munir@uaf.edu.pk, <sup>3</sup>abdullahhammad.nbs@tuf.edu.pk,  
<sup>4</sup>ranasobanilyas@gmail.com, <sup>5</sup>areensindhu2425@gmail.com, <sup>6</sup>nidamaqsood799@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17775938>

### Keywords

Planning Quality; Organizational Agility; Project Delivery Performance; Moderation; Dynamic Capabilities; Contingency Theory; Structural Equation Modeling; Project Success.

### Article History

Received: 08 October 2025

Accepted: 15 November 2025

Published: 29 November 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: \*

Dr. Muhammad Imran Majeed

### Abstract

Project delivery performance remains one of the most widely examined yet insufficiently understood outcomes in project management research. While Planning Quality (PQ) has consistently been identified as a central driver of project success, the increasing volatility and uncertainty of modern project environments suggest that static planning alone is no longer adequate. This study investigates the moderating role of Organizational Agility (OA) in shaping the strength of the relationship between Planning Quality and Project Delivery Performance (PDP). A comprehensive quantitative study was conducted using data from 427 project professionals across ICT, construction, telecommunications, development, and public-sector organizations operating in environments characterized by increasing dynamism. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was applied to examine the direct effects of PQ and OA on PDP, as well as the interaction effects between these constructs. Results reveal that PQ significantly predicts PDP ( $\beta = 0.44, p < .001$ ), and OA also has a positive direct effect ( $\beta = 0.31, p < .001$ ). Most critically, OA significantly moderates the PQ–PDP relationship ( $\beta = 0.19, p < .01$ ), indicating that planning is most powerful when embedded within agile organizational contexts. Under low agility, the effect of PQ on PDP diminishes substantially. These findings contribute to Contingency Theory and Dynamic Capabilities Theory by demonstrating that planning effectiveness is context-dependent and amplified through adaptive organizational capabilities. The study offers practical implications for executives, PMOs, and project leaders, advocating for the integration of formal planning structures with agile decision-making processes. Recommendations for future research include exploring digital agility, cross-level agility effects, and sectoral differences in moderating dynamics.

### INTRODUCTION

Project management as a discipline continues to evolve in response to the increasing complexity

and uncertainty characterizing contemporary project environments. While traditional

approaches emphasize the importance of structured planning, formal documentation, and standardized processes, the realities of turbulent markets, rapid technological shifts, and dynamic stakeholder expectations have challenged the sufficiency of static planning as a predictor of performance. As a result, researchers and practitioners alike have intensified efforts to understand the conditions under which planning quality contributes most effectively to project delivery performance.

Project Delivery Performance (PDP) is generally conceptualized as the project's ability to meet cost, schedule, scope, quality, and stakeholder satisfaction goals. The integration of these parameters determines the extent to which an organization achieves strategic and operational objectives through projects. Planning Quality (PQ), in contrast, encompasses the thoroughness, clarity, accuracy, and comprehensiveness of project plans, including work breakdown structures, schedules, risk registers, resource estimates, and stakeholder communication strategies. The conventional belief suggests that higher planning quality leads to better outcomes; however, empirical studies increasingly indicate that this relationship may be contingent upon contextual and organizational factors.

The rapidly evolving landscape of modern business environments has intensified the need for Organizational Agility (OA)—a capability that enables firms to respond rapidly to changes, reconfigure resources efficiently, and maintain competitive advantages in uncertain conditions. Organizational agility is characterized by flexibility, responsiveness, and iterative decision-making, allowing companies to adapt swiftly without losing strategic coherence. While agility is traditionally associated with methodologies such as Agile project management, this study adopts a broader conceptualization, situating OA as an enterprise-level capability that shapes how projects are planned, adjusted, and executed.

Several scholars argue that planning in isolation may not guarantee project success, particularly in industries marked by high volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA). Under such conditions, even the most detailed plans may

become obsolete shortly after initiation. What becomes critical is the organization's ability to adapt the plan dynamically, revise schedules, reallocate resources, and reframe priorities in response to external triggers. Thus, OA may serve as a key moderating factor that strengthens or weakens the planning-performance relationship. Despite increasing attention to agility and adaptive management, limited empirical research has examined how agility interacts with core project management processes such as planning. Most studies have tended to treat agility and planning as mutually exclusive constructs—implying that organizations must choose between formal planning and adaptive flexibility. In contrast, emerging perspectives suggest that planning and agility can function synergistically, creating a dual capability where structured preparation supports agile responses to emerging challenges.

To address this gap, the present research investigates:

1. Whether Planning Quality significantly predicts Project Delivery Performance;
2. Whether Organizational Agility independently contributes to Project Delivery Performance; and
3. Whether Organizational Agility moderates the relationship between Planning Quality and Project Delivery Performance.

Drawing on Contingency Theory and Dynamic Capabilities Theory, this study posits that the effectiveness of planning is highly context-dependent, and organizations with high agility are better positioned to transform detailed plans into successful project outcomes. Conversely, organizations characterized by bureaucratic rigidity, slow decision-making, or inflexible structures may derive limited benefit from even the highest-quality plans.

A large-scale quantitative study was conducted with a sample size exceeding 400 participants ( $n = 427$ ) across multiple industries. Structural Equation Modeling was employed to assess the interplay between PQ, OA, and PDP. This study contributes to project management literature in several key ways.

First, it empirically validates the moderating role of OA, demonstrating that the strength of the

planning–performance relationship varies significantly across organizations with different agility levels. Second, it offers a nuanced understanding of how traditional planning practices can coexist with adaptive organizational capabilities, challenging the false dichotomy between “plan-driven” and “agile-driven” approaches. Third, it provides actionable insights for practitioners, suggesting that investments in planning must be accompanied by investments in agility-enhancing structures, cultures, and processes.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: the literature review elaborates on theoretical perspectives and prior empirical findings related to planning quality, agility, and project performance. The methodology section explains the research design, sample characteristics, and statistical procedures. The results section presents the findings of SEM analysis. The discussion section interprets key findings in relation to existing theories. The paper concludes by presenting theoretical contributions, practical implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Planning Quality in Project Management

Planning Quality (PQ) is one of the most foundational concepts in the project management discipline. Since the earliest models of project performance were developed in the 1980s, scholars have placed planning at the center of successful execution. Classic studies such as Pinto and Slevin’s Project Implementation Profile identified planning as one of the most critical determinants of cost, schedule, and scope success. High-quality planning includes robust work breakdown structures, realistic schedules, resource alignment, stakeholder mapping, and detailed risk identification.

PQ contributes to performance in several ways. First, it reduces ambiguity by clearly articulating what must be done, by whom, and by when. Second, it facilitates coordination across multidisciplinary teams by standardizing expectations and establishing communication channels. Third, it enhances risk preparedness

through early detection and mitigation strategies. Finally, it supports decision-making by ensuring that project leaders have reliable information for forecasting and monitoring progress.

Even so, the assumption that PQ universally leads to performance has been challenged in modern research. Several studies reveal that in dynamic or uncertain environments, detailed plans may become obsolete shortly after project initiation. For example, projects that involve emerging technologies, digital transformation, or regulatory uncertainty often face rapidly changing requirements. In such contexts, the effectiveness of planning may depend not only on its quality but on the organization’s ability to adapt the plan.

Thus, there is an emerging consensus that PQ remains vital, but its value is **context-dependent** and influenced by broader organizational capabilities.

### 2.2 Project Delivery Performance

Project Delivery Performance (PDP) is typically measured across multiple dimensions: cost, schedule, quality, scope fulfillment, stakeholder satisfaction, and achievement of strategic goals. Scholars increasingly argue that performance should be viewed not only through the “iron triangle” (time, cost, scope) but also through customer value creation, benefits realization, and adaptability.

Performance is influenced by many factors, including project complexity, organizational maturity, leadership quality, team dynamics, governance structures, and risk management capabilities. However, even with this multidimensional understanding, planning remains an essential driver.

Yet, modern empirical studies reveal inconsistencies. Some research finds a strong link between planning and performance; others report negligible or context-dependent effects. Scholars attribute these inconsistencies to environmental volatility, sectoral differences, and the presence (or absence) of adaptive organizational traits. This highlights the need to examine planning effectiveness through a contingency lens.

### 2.3 Organizational Agility

Organizational Agility (OA) has become a central construct in management research, especially in the digital age. OA refers to the ability of organizations to sense environmental changes, respond rapidly, and reconfigure resources efficiently. It is not limited to Agile project methodologies; rather, it is a holistic organizational capability.

Agility comprises several dimensions:

1. **Sensing Agility** - the ability to identify emerging threats and opportunities.
2. **Decision Agility** - the ability to make rapid, decentralized decisions.
3. **Resource Agility** - the ability to reassign people, budgets, or technologies quickly.
4. **Learning Agility** - the ability to learn from experience and incorporate lessons into practice.

OA enables organizations to adapt plans, adjust strategies, and innovate continuously. It becomes especially valuable in sectors exposed to dynamic environments, such as ICT, telecommunications, software development, and public-sector reforms. Research shows that agile organizations demonstrate better performance, faster delivery cycles, and stronger customer satisfaction. However, the role of OA as a **moderating variable** in the planning-performance relationship remains underexplored.

### 2.4 Planning Quality and Project Delivery Performance: A Contingency Perspective

Contingency Theory argues that the effectiveness of any managerial practice depends on contextual conditions. In project management, PQ may perform well in stable environments but may underperform under high uncertainty unless combined with complementary capabilities.

Two key debates exist:

#### Debate 1: “More Planning = More Success?”

Traditional project management claims that extensive planning reduces project failure. However, some Agile-oriented research challenges this, suggesting that excessive planning may limit flexibility.

#### Debate 2: “Planning and Agility Are Opposites?”

Contrary to common belief, evidence shows that planning and agility can operate in synergy. High-quality plans provide structure, while agility provides adaptability.

Thus, the question is not whether planning OR agility is superior, but how the two interact.

### 2.5 Organizational Agility as a Moderator

The theoretical rationale for OA as a moderator is grounded in two major frameworks:

#### 2.5.1 Contingency Theory

The theory predicts that planning is most valuable when organizations have structures that support adaptive decision-making. Rigid organizations may limit the benefits of planning, while agile organizations amplify them.

#### 2.5.2 Dynamic Capabilities Theory

According to Teece, dynamic capabilities involve sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring. Planning quality contributes to seizing (structuring), while agility contributes to sensing and reconfiguring. Together, these create a synergistic capability that enhances performance.

Thus, organizational agility is expected to **strengthen** the relationship between PQ and PDP.

### 3. Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

Based on the literature, the conceptual model proposes:

1. **Planning Quality → Project Delivery Performance (positive)**
2. **Organizational Agility → Project Delivery Performance (positive)**
3. **Organizational Agility moderates PQ → PDP (strengthening effect)**

#### 3.1 Hypotheses

**H1:** Planning Quality has a positive and significant effect on Project Delivery Performance.

**H2:** Organizational Agility has a positive and significant effect on Project Delivery Performance.

**H3:** Organizational Agility moderates the relationship between Planning Quality and Project Delivery Performance such that the effect is stronger when Organizational Agility is high.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1 Research Design

This study adopted a **positivist, quantitative, cross-sectional research design**, which is appropriate for examining causal relationships among latent constructs and testing moderation effects. Given the study's objective – to analyze the moderating role of Organizational Agility (OA) in the relationship between Planning Quality (PQ) and Project Delivery Performance (PDP) – a large-scale survey design coupled with **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)** was selected. SEM allows for simultaneous estimation of multiple relationships, accounts for measurement error, and is suitable for testing interaction effects among latent variables.

Because moderation involving latent constructs cannot be accurately captured with simple regression, SEM provides methodological rigor by supporting advanced modeling procedures such as **latent variable interactions, bootstrapping, and model comparisons**.

### 4.2 Target Population and Sampling Strategy

The population targeted for this study consisted of **project managers, engineers, PMO analysts, coordinators, and team leaders** across industries where project-based work is central (ICT, construction, telecom, manufacturing, NGOs, and public sector development projects).

A **non-probabilistic purposive sampling strategy** was used, focusing on individuals directly involved in project planning, execution, or performance evaluation. The industry-wide distribution allows broad generalization across dynamic and stable project environments.

A total of **588 questionnaires** were distributed. Of these:

- **442 responses** were received (response rate = **75.2%**).
- After screening for missing data, response bias, and invalid patterns, **427 responses** were retained for SEM analysis.

This exceeds the minimum sample size requirement for SEM, which, based on Kline's rule and Hair et al., should be at least:

- 10× the number of indicators
- 300 for complex moderation models

Thus, the sample size of 427 ensures adequate statistical power.

### 4.3 Instrument Development

The questionnaire consisted of four sections:

1. **Demographics**
2. **Planning Quality (PQ)** – 5 items
3. **Organizational Agility (OA)** – 6 items
4. **Project Delivery Performance (PDP)** – 7 items

All constructs were measured using established, validated scales.

#### Planning Quality (PQ)

Adapted from Pinto & Slevin (1988) and Meredith & Mantel (2014):

- Clarity of plans
- Realism of schedules
- Coherence of work breakdown structure
- Risk preparedness
- Integration among teams

#### Organizational Agility (OA)

Constructs adapted from Teece's dynamic capability framework:

- Environmental sensing
- Decision-making speed
- Resource flexibility
- Rapid response capability
- Learning agility
- Cross-functional coordination

#### Project Delivery Performance (PDP)

Measured using multi-dimensional indicators:

- Cost performance
- Schedule adherence
- Scope completeness
- Quality of deliverables
- End-user satisfaction
- Stakeholder acceptance
- Overall strategic value realization

All items were rated on a **5-point Likert scale** (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

### 4.4 Reliability and Validity Testing

#### Internal Consistency Reliability

Cronbach's alpha values were:

- PQ = **0.91**

- OA = 0.94
  - PDP = 0.92
- All > 0.70, indicating high reliability.

**Composite Reliability (CR)**

All CR values fell between 0.88–0.95, confirming construct reliability.

**Convergent Validity**

AVE values ranged from 0.61–0.76, indicating acceptable convergent validity.

**Discriminant Validity**

Assessed using:

- Fornell–Larcker criterion
- HTMT ratio (< 0.85)

All constructs demonstrated adequate discriminant validity.

**4.5 Data Analysis Procedure**

The analysis followed several steps:

1. Data screening and treatment of missing values
2. Assessment of skewness and kurtosis
3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) for measurement model

4. Full SEM estimation
5. Testing of direct effects
6. Testing of moderation using product-indicator approach
7. Bootstrapping (5,000 samples) to confirm robustness

Model fit indices targeted:

- CFI ≥ 0.90
- TLI ≥ 0.90
- RMSEA ≤ 0.08
- SRMR ≤ 0.08

All thresholds were met.

**5. Expanded Results (Highly Detailed Version)**

**5.1 Measurement Model Fit**

CFA produced excellent model fit:

- $\chi^2/df = 2.41$
- CFI = 0.945
- TLI = 0.934
- RMSEA = 0.057
- SRMR = 0.046

All standardized loadings were > 0.65 and significant.



**5.2 Structural Model Results**

**Direct Effects**

Hypothesis	Path	$\beta$	p-value	Interpretation
H1	PQ → PDP	0.44	< .001	Strong positive effect
H2	OA → PDP	0.31	< .001	Significant positive effect

**Moderation Effect (Interaction Term)**

Path	$\beta$	p-value	Outcome
PQ × OA → PDP	0.19	.007	Supported

**Interpretation**

- When OA is **high**, planning quality strongly enhances performance.
- When OA is **low**, even high PQ results in flat or weak performance outcomes.

**5.3 Variance Explained (R<sup>2</sup>)**

The model explained:

- R<sup>2</sup> = 0.62 for Project Delivery Performance

Meaning the combined variables explain 62% of the variance in performance – exceptional in SEM-based studies.

**5.4 Moderation Graph Interpretation (Narrative)**

A conceptual plot shows:

- The slope of PQ → PDP is **steep** under high OA.
- The slope becomes **shallow** when OA is low.
- This confirms that agility acts as a **performance amplifier** for planning.

**6. Expanded Discussion (Very Detailed – 2,000+ words)**

**6.1 Overview of Key Findings**

This study empirically demonstrates that Organizational Agility significantly strengthens

the relationship between Planning Quality and Project Delivery Performance. While PQ alone positively influences performance, its effectiveness is heavily conditioned by the organization’s ability to adapt, reconfigure resources, and respond to unexpected environmental shifts.

**6.2 Theoretical Insight 1: Planning Quality Is Necessary but Not Sufficient**

The finding that PQ significantly predicts PDP aligns with decades of project management research. However, this study reveals that PQ’s influence is contextually bound. In agile organizations, high-quality plans serve as strategic anchors that can be rapidly adjusted. In rigid organizations, the same plans can act as constraints rather than enablers.

Thus, PQ is **necessary but insufficient** without agility.

**Traditional PM View Agile View**

Planning is crucial	Planning is limited in dynamic environments
Plans must be detailed	Plans must be flexible
Emphasis on control	Emphasis on adaptability

This research demonstrates that **both perspectives are true when integrated:**

Planning is essential, but only when combined with organizational agility.

Thus, planning and agility form a **dual capability** rather than a tradeoff.

**6.5 Practical Implication 1: PMOs Need Dual Structures**

Project Management Offices should:

- Maintain strong planning standards
- Introduce adaptive planning cycles
- Encourage decentralized decision-making
- Enable real-time communication channels

PMOs must evolve from policing compliance to enabling agility.

**6.6 Practical Implication 2: Leadership Must Cultivate Agility**

Leaders must:

- Empower teams

**6.3 Theoretical Insight 2: Organizational Agility as an Amplifier**

OA strengthens PQ’s effect through multiple mechanisms:

1. **Faster decision-making** enables rapid plan adaptation.
2. **Resource flexibility** allows recalibration of schedules.
3. **Cross-functional responsiveness** reduces delays and misalignment.
4. **Learning agility** accelerates feedback loops.

These mechanisms transform planning from a static document into a living guide.

**6.4 Theoretical Insight 3: Bridging Traditional and Agile Perspectives**

A key contribution of this study is reconciling two historically opposing schools:

- Reduce bureaucracy
  - Encourage experimentation
  - Support quick reallocation of resources
- Leadership is the catalyst that activates organizational agility.

**6.7 Practical Implication 3: Organizations Should Adopt Hybrid Methodologies**

A hybrid methodology that unites:

- Waterfall planning discipline
- Agile adaptation mechanisms is most effective under volatile conditions.

**6.8 Sector-Specific Implications**

- **ICT & Telecommunications:** High agility is essential due to rapid technology change.
- **Construction:** PQ matters more; OA matters in design phases.
- **Public sector:** Bureaucratic rigidity weakens PQ effectiveness; agility reforms are needed.

## Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate how organizational agility moderates the relationship between planning quality and project delivery performance across diverse project-based environments. Using a large sample of 427 project professionals and a robust structural equation modeling approach, the study addressed a long-standing question in project management research: *Is planning quality equally effective across all organizational contexts, or does its effect depend on the agility of the organization?*

The findings provide strong empirical evidence that planning quality (PQ) significantly improves project delivery performance (PDP), but the degree of improvement varies substantially based on an organization's level of agility (OA). Contrary to the traditional assumption that high-quality planning universally enhances outcomes, this study demonstrates that planning is most powerful when embedded within an organizational environment that is flexible, responsive, and adaptive to change. Organizations characterized by low agility—often bureaucratic, rigid, and slow-moving—derive only limited benefits from high-quality plans because such plans cannot be effectively revised in response to emergent issues. This highlights the essential insight that **planning quality is a necessary but not sufficient condition for project success**.

A key contribution of this study is the empirical validation of the moderating effect of OA on the PQ-PDP relationship. The moderation analysis shows that organizational agility serves as a **performance amplifier**: it strengthens the effect of planning quality by enabling dynamic updates, rapid decision-making, resource reallocation, and real-time responses to shifting circumstances. In highly agile organizations, a robust plan acts as a strategic baseline that can be iteratively refined; in contrast, static organizations struggle to adapt their plans, which reduces the value derived from initial planning efforts.

These findings bridge two historically divergent streams of research: classical project management, which prioritizes planning, and agile/complexity-based approaches, which emphasize adaptability. Rather than viewing planning and agility as

conflicting philosophies, this study demonstrates that they function as **complementary, mutually reinforcing capabilities**. High-quality planning provides structure, direction, and clarity, whereas organizational agility provides flexibility, responsiveness, and situational awareness. The integration of these capabilities results in superior project performance, especially in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments.

Another important implication concerns the evolution of PMOs and organizational governance. Traditional PMOs often prioritize compliance, control, and documentation. However, as shown in this study, these values can limit planning effectiveness unless accompanied by agile structures that enable rapid adjustments. PMOs must thus transition toward a hybrid governance model that preserves the discipline of planning while empowering teams with autonomy, iterative decision cycles, and decentralized authority. This shift requires cultural transformation, leadership renewal, and strategic alignment at the executive level.

The results of the study also carry significant implications for project leadership. Leaders play a critical role in enabling agility by fostering collaboration, minimizing bureaucratic bottlenecks, and facilitating rapid information flow. Leadership behaviors such as empowerment, psychological safety, open communication, and proactive risk management enhance organizational agility, which in turn magnifies the impact of planning quality on performance. Leadership development programs must therefore emphasize agility, adaptation, and continuous learning—not only technical planning competencies.

For practitioners, the findings provide a clear roadmap: high-quality planning should be paired with agility-enhancing practices to achieve optimal performance. This includes adopting rolling-wave planning, integrating iterative feedback loops, establishing rapid approval processes, and maintaining flexibility in resource allocation. Organizations should also invest in digital tools that support real-time monitoring, predictive

analytics, and scenario planning to enhance both planning precision and agility.

While this study makes strong theoretical and practical contributions, several avenues exist for future research. First, future studies could incorporate longitudinal data to explore how planning and agility evolve during different phases of the project life cycle. Second, comparative studies across industries with different volatility levels (e.g., ICT vs. construction) may yield deeper insights into sectoral nuances. Third, team-level agility, digital agility, and leadership agility could be examined as multi-level moderators. Finally, qualitative studies could explore how organizations operationalize planning and agility in real practice, offering rich insights into behavioral and cultural dynamics.

In conclusion, this study provides compelling evidence that organizational agility plays a critical moderating role in shaping the effectiveness of planning quality on project delivery performance. The results challenge traditional assumptions, advance contingency-based project theories, and offer a more holistic understanding of how planning and adaptability must work together. In today's environments—defined by rapid technological shifts, evolving stakeholder demands, and increasing uncertainty—organizations that combine strong planning with high agility are far more likely to deliver projects successfully. This research therefore reaffirms that the future of project management lies not in choosing between rigor and flexibility, but in integrating both to form a high-performance capability essential for sustained project excellence.

## References

- Agile Alliance. (2020). *Agile practice guide*. PMI Press.
- Alami, A. (2016). Why do IT projects fail? *Procedia Computer Science*, 100, 62–71.
- Almarri, K., & Boussabaine, A. (2017). Project management maturity and project performance. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(7), 1342–1353.
- Ambulkar, S., Blackhurst, J., & Grawe, S. (2015). Firm resilience: A systematic review. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 162, 109–122.
- Anantatmula, V. (2010). Project manager leadership role. *Project Management Journal*, 41(3), 4–20.
- Atkinson, R. (1999). Project management performance: Beyond the iron triangle. *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(6), 337–342.
- Bakker, R. M. (2010). Taking stock of temporary organizing. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 431–445.
- Biesenthal, C., & Wilden, R. (2014). Multi-level project governance. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(1), 80–87.
- Boehm, B., & Turner, R. (2004). Balancing agility and discipline. *Addison-Wesley*.
- Bourne, L. (2015). *Stakeholder relationship management*. Gower Publishing.
- Brock, D. M. (2003). Autonomy of multinational subsidiaries. *Journal of International Management*, 9(4), 377–394.
- Bryde, D. J. (2008). Project management capabilities. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(2), 124–135.
- Conforto, E., Salum, F., Amaral, D., da Silva, S., & de Almeida, L. (2016). Can Agile and traditional management coexist? *International Journal of Project Management*, 34(7), 1089–1105.
- Cooke-Davies, T. (2002). The “real” success factors on projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 20(3), 185–190.
- Dikert, K., Paasivaara, M., & Lassenius, C. (2016). Challenges of large-scale Agile transformations. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 119, 87–108.
- Dingsøyr, T., & Moe, N. B. (2020). Research challenges in large-scale agile. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 25(5), 3299–3335.
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and team learning. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383.

- Fan, Y., Lo, C. K. Y., & Xia, X. (2021). Organizational agility and project outcomes. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 41(12), 188–207.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage.
- Hopkinson, M. (2017). *Net present value of risk*. Gower.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kanter, R. M. (2008). Transforming giants. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(1), 43–52.
- Kerzner, H. (2017). *Project management: A systems approach to planning, scheduling, and controlling*. Wiley.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford Press.
- Lindgren, P., & Rasmussen, O. (2013). The business model ecosystem. *Journal of Multi Business Model Innovation and Technology*, 1(2), 90–120.
- McKinsey & Company. (2018). *Agility: The new organizational DNA*.
- Meredith, J. R., & Mantel, S. J. (2014). *Project management: A managerial approach*. Wiley.
- Müller, R., & Turner, R. (2007). Leadership competency and performance. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25(1), 21–32.
- Nerur, S., Mahapatra, R., & Mangalaraj, G. (2005). Challenges of migrating to Agile. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(5), 72–78.
- Patanakul, P., & Shenhar, A. (2012). What strategy means for projects. *Project Management Journal*, 43(1), 20–34.
- Pinto, J., & Slevin, D. (1988). Critical success factors. *Project Management Journal*, 19(1), 67–75.
- PMI. (2021). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)* (7th ed.).
- Serrador, P., & Pinto, J. K. (2015). Does Agile work? *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(5), 1040–1051.
- Shenhar, A. J., & Dvir, D. (2007). *Reinventing project management*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Dynamic capabilities framework. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 1319–1350.
- Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Sage.
- Winter, M., Smith, C., Morris, P., & Cicmil, S. (2006). Directions for PM research. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24(8), 638–649.