JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
ISSN: 2576-0017
2026, VOL 9, NO 1

Global Agile Leadership: Bridging Cultures And Building Collaborative Teams In Enterprise Transformation

Bhabindra Bahadur

Independent Researcher, USA

Abstract
Enterprise Agile transformations are challenging organizational change projects, and go way beyond the adoption of a procedural framework to include critical changes in leadership paradigm, cultural processes, and cooperative practices. This article explores the human aspects of scaling Agile in international companies, where interdependence of servant leadership, cross-cultural intelligence, and mechanisms of psychological safety are all-important factors in ensuring sustainable transformation success. The article examines distributed and multi-vendor program settings, identifies correlates between the view of traditional command-and-control leadership models in Agile settings, and the requirement to apply servant leadership styles to eliminate systemic impediments, encourage team autonomy, and develop organizational capacity to adapt. The cross-cultural dynamics exploration shows that successful Agile implementation is based on more advanced cultural intelligence of coaches and leaders, it addresses differences in power distance, style of communication, and norms of decision-making across geographies, and still remains methodologically sound. Moreover, the neuroscience of psychological safety sheds light on the reason why vulnerability-based trust and shared responsibility are key pillars of distributed team performance, and program managers must act as cultural architects who strategically develop practices of interaction that maintain collaboration in the context of organizational complexity. These human dimensions are integrated to imply that the use of those interventions that focus on single dimensions gives much less effect, and that the holistic approach that builds leadership skills, determines cultural norms, and ensures safety conditions builds mutually reinforcing processes that increase the pace of transformation. The practical implications drive the point home by placing the same emphasis on investing in human infrastructure as in technical and process dimensions, and the role of transformation as a continuous cultural evolution instead of a finite project implementation process. This anthropomorphic viewpoint recognizes that Agile change ultimately fails or succeeds on the basis of whether individuals adopt new working methods, build collaborative skills as well, and keep up commitment amid challenges that are unavoidable when transforming an enterprise.

Keywords: Agile Transformation, Servant Leadership, Cultural Intelligence, Psychological Safety, Distributed Teams.

1. Introduction: Beyond Process - The Cultural Imperative in Agile Transformations

The contemporary landscape of enterprise Agile transformations reveals a fundamental misalignment between theoretical frameworks and practical implementation outcomes. While organizations invest substantially in adopting Agile methodologies such as Scrum, SAFe, and LeSS, the literature consistently demonstrates that technical process adoption alone does not guarantee transformation success [1]. This discrepancy emerges from a critical oversight: treating Agile transformation primarily as a procedural change rather than a comprehensive cultural evolution that fundamentally reshapes how people interact, make decisions, and create value within organizational ecosystems.

The paradigm shift from process-centric to people-centric Agile adoption represents a maturation in understanding organizational change dynamics. Early Agile implementations focused predominantly on ceremony adoption, artifact creation, and role definition, operating under the assumption that structural changes would automatically yield cultural transformation [1]. However, empirical evidence from large-scale enterprise transformations has illuminated the limitations of this mechanistic approach. Organizations that achieve sustainable Agile maturity recognize that frameworks serve as scaffolding rather than solutions, requiring deliberate attention to human dimensions, including trust-building, psychological safety, and collaborative capacity development across distributed teams and diverse cultural contexts.

The persistent gap between Agile frameworks and organizational reality manifests in several observable patterns. Traditional hierarchical power structures often remain intact despite Agile role definitions, creating tension between servant leadership principles and established command-and-control norms. Cross-functional collaboration, central to Agile philosophy, frequently encounters resistance rooted in functional silos, performance management systems, and resource allocation models that reward individual rather than collective achievement [2]. Furthermore, distributed and multi-vendor environments introduce additional complexity layers, where geographical dispersion, cultural diversity, and contractual boundaries challenge the collaborative intimacy that Agile methodologies presume.

This research examines human factors in enterprise-scale Agile transformations, specifically focusing on the intersection of leadership practices, cultural dynamics, and organizational behavior in global program contexts. The investigation extends beyond surface-level process compliance to explore how servant leadership, cross-cultural coaching competencies, and psychological safety mechanisms enable or constrain transformation outcomes in complex organizational systems. Theoretical foundations draw from organizational change theory, particularly Kotter's change management framework and Schein's cultural transformation models, integrated with Agile principles to create a comprehensive lens for understanding human-centric transformation dynamics [2]. This synthesis acknowledges that sustainable Agile adoption requires simultaneous attention to structural, behavioral, and mindset dimensions, positioning program managers and Agile leaders as cultural architects who deliberately design conditions for collaborative excellence across organizational boundaries.

2. Servant Leadership as a Catalyst for Transformation

The reconceptualization of leadership roles in Agile contexts represents a profound departure from traditional management paradigms that have dominated organizational thinking for decades. Command-and-control leadership, rooted in industrial-era hierarchies, emphasizes directive authority, centralized decision-making, and compliance-based execution. In contrast, servant leadership within Agile transformations inverts this power dynamic, positioning leaders as enablers who create conditions for team success rather than controllers who dictate solutions [3]. This philosophical shift challenges deeply embedded organizational assumptions about authority, expertise, and value creation, requiring leaders to develop new competencies centered on facilitation, coaching, and systemic thinking rather than technical expertise and directive control.

The servant leader's toolkit encompasses a multifaceted set of practices designed to remove impediments, build organizational capacity, and foster genuine autonomy across teams and value streams. Impediment removal extends beyond addressing tactical blockers to include dismantling systemic barriers such as bureaucratic approval processes, resource allocation inefficiencies, and organizational policies that constrain team agility [3]. Capacity building involves developing both technical and collaborative capabilities within teams, creating learning environments where experimentation is encouraged and failure

is reframed as a developmental opportunity. Fostering autonomy requires leaders to deliberately create decision-making space for teams while maintaining appropriate governance boundaries, balancing empowerment with accountability in ways that align with organizational risk tolerance and strategic objectives.

Empirical evidence from multi-vendor program environments reveals both the transformative potential and practical challenges of implementing servant leadership at scale. Research examining complex program delivery contexts demonstrates that servant leadership practices correlate with improved team engagement, increased innovation capacity, and enhanced adaptability to changing requirements [4]. Multi-vendor environments, characterized by diverse organizational cultures, competing incentives, and contractual complexities, provide particularly fertile ground for testing servant leadership efficacy. In these contexts, servant leaders function as cultural translators and relationship architects, building trust across organizational boundaries and creating shared commitment to collective outcomes despite inherent structural tensions.

The tensions and paradoxes surrounding accountability versus empowerment in scaled Agile frameworks present persistent challenges for servant leaders navigating enterprise transformations. While Agile principles emphasize team autonomy and self-organization, organizational realities demand clear accountability mechanisms, performance visibility, and risk management structures [4]. Servant leaders must negotiate this paradoxical space, creating empowerment within boundaries rather than pursuing unbounded autonomy that organizational systems cannot sustain. This negotiation becomes particularly complex in regulated industries, publicly traded companies, and contexts where governance requirements impose constraints on decision-making latitude. Successfully managing these tensions requires sophisticated leadership judgment that honors both Agile values and legitimate organizational needs for predictability, compliance, and fiduciary responsibility.

Table 1: Servant Leadership Practices and Organizational Impact in Agile Transformations [3, 4]

Leadership Practice	Implementation Characteristics	Organizational Outcomes
Impediment Removal	Dismantling systemic barriers, including bureaucratic approval processes, resource allocation inefficiencies, and constraining organizational policies	Enhanced team agility and reduced organizational friction in value delivery
Capacity Building	Developing technical and collaborative capabilities through learning environments that encourage experimentation and reframe failure as a developmental opportunity	Increased innovation capacity and improved team competencies across technical and interpersonal domains
Fostering Autonomy	Creating decision-making space for teams while maintaining governance boundaries that balance empowerment with accountability	Improved team engagement and adaptability to changing requirements within an appropriate risk tolerance
Cultural Translation	Functioning as relationship architects and cultural translators across organizational boundaries in multi-vendor environments	Enhanced trust-building across diverse organizational cultures and shared commitment to collective outcomes

Paradox Navigation	Negotiating tension between team autonomy and accountability mechanisms through sophisticated leadership judgment	Sustainable empowerment within boundaries that honor both Agile values and organizational governance requirements

3. Distributed Agile Team Cross-Cultural Dynamics.

As a core competency, cultural intelligence has become an inseparable part of Agile coaches and leaders who have to operate in the realm of globally distributed transformation efforts. This advanced feature goes beyond simple cultural awareness to profound knowledge of the ways in which cultural values influence workplace behaviors, patterns of interactions, and preferences for working with various geographical contexts [5]. The cultural intelligence in distributed Agile settings has a direct impact on the success of coaching intervention, quality of team interaction, and transformation outcome sustainability. Leaders with high cultural intelligence understand that Agile concepts, though universal in vision, need to be applied contextually in ways that preserve local standards and promote joint excellence. Lack of cultural intelligence most often translates into poor expectations and communication failures and opposition to Agile behaviors that are viewed as culturally incongruent, which eventually suppresses the pace of transformation and team cohesion across organizational lines.

Making sense of power distance, communication orientation, and decision-making standards across geographies is one of the most relevant issues of distributed Agile implementation. The framework of cultural dimensions by Hofstede sheds light on significant differences in the way societies organize their relationships of authority, in which cultures with high power distance anticipate and permit hierarchical decision-making, and in which cultures with low power distance embrace an egalitarian participation [5]. These inherent distinctions are strained by the focus of Agile on self-organizing teams and flat organizational hierarchies, especially in areas where challenging the decision-making of leaders goes against the firmly established cultural norms. These challenges are further complicated by the differences in communication style in that the cultures with a high-context cannot express meaning through explicit informational exchange, whereas low-context cultures cannot express meaning through implicit understanding, nonverbal communication, or relationship history. Decision-making rules also vary, with some cultures highly appreciating the consensus-building process that will lead to collective buy-in, and other cultures highly admiring hierarchical authority or personal expertise to make timely decisions, which can produce potential friction in cross-cultural sprinting planning and backlog prioritization processes.

The results of the case study on the delivery of multi-country programs disclose useful coaching techniques applicable to the reduction of the existing cultural distance that do not jeopardize Agile integrity. Studies conducted on distributed teams that work on more than two continents have shown that successful coaches can create culturally responsive facilitation strategies instead of employing generic methodologies in all situations [6]. These strategies are effective because they help to set up clear team working arrangements which put implicit cultural assumptions on the table and negotiable, provide a variety of communication channels, to suit different preferences for synchronous interaction or asynchronous interaction, and set up decision-making protocols which respect both the needs of efficiency and the cultural needs of consultation and consensus. Specific success is reported by coaches who represent themselves as cultural learners, including team members, to give insights on how the Agile practice could be modified to honor the local norms without sacrificing the fundamental principles of transparency, inspection, and adaptation.

It may take customization through appropriate consideration of both the methodological fidelity and cultural sensitivity to build bridges by adapting Agile ceremonies and practices. Anonymous feedback systems can also be used in sprint retrospectives in cultures where open criticism can disrupt harmony in the group, whereas they may spend more time on relationship building during sprint planning in collectivist cultures, where building trust is a prerequisite to effective cooperation in tasks [6]. To overcome the hierarchical cultures, where standups may need to be restructured to incorporate turn-taking protocols or to fit into the distributed time zones without disadvantageous specific geographies, daily standups may need to be

restructured in terms of timing. Such adaptations reflect the application of cultural intelligence, which admits that the successful implementation of Agile needs to be based on situational flexibility and a solid adherence to the principles of iterative development, continuous improvement, and the creation of customer value.

Table 2: Cultural Intelligence Dimensions and Implications for Distributed Agile Teams [5, 6]

Cultural Dimension	Manifestation in Workplace Context	Impact on Agile Implementation
Power Distance Orientation	High power distance cultures anticipate hierarchical decision-making, while low power distance cultures embrace egalitarian participation	Creates tension with Agile's emphasis on self-organizing teams and flat hierarchies, particularly where challenging leadership decisions contradict cultural norms
Communication Style	High-context cultures rely on implicit understanding and nonverbal cues, while low-context cultures depend on explicit informational exchange	Generates misunderstandings in distributed team interactions and requires diverse communication channels to accommodate synchronous and asynchronous preferences
Decision-Making Protocols	Some cultures prioritize consensus-building for collective buy-in, while others value hierarchical authority or personal expertise for timely decisions	Produces potential friction in cross-cultural sprint planning and backlog prioritization processes, requiring negotiated protocols
Feedback and Criticism Norms	Cultures vary in acceptance of direct criticism, with some valuing harmony preservation over open confrontation	Necessitates adaptations such as anonymous feedback systems in sprint retrospectives to maintain psychological safety while preserving transparency
Relationship-Task Balance	Collectivist cultures require trust-building as a prerequisite to task cooperation, while individualist cultures may prioritize immediate task execution	Demands extended time allocation for relationship building during sprint planning and ceremonies to establish a foundation for effective collaboration

4. Sharing Ownership and Psychological Safety in Complex Systems.

The psychological safety neuroscience offers a solid ground for why this construct is central to team performance within Agile transformations. The neuroscientific evidence shows that neural networks prompted by perceived threats to the social status, independence, or belonging to a specific group, trigger the amygdala-driven fight-or-flight responses, which disrupt the prefrontal cortex activity that is crucial to creative problem-solving, collaborative decision-making, and failure learning [7]. The cognitive resources of team members are used in protecting themselves in psychologically unsafe settings, as opposed to generating innovations and thus information sharing, experimentation, and dissenting views, which tend to harbor critical information, are suppressed. Psychologically safe teams, in turn, have a higher level of collective intelligence; they are more prepared to bring up issues early and have a better ability to respond to any emerging challenges in an adaptive manner. In the case of distributed Agile teams that span both organizational and geographical borders, psychological safety is especially significant since the physical distance, cultural disparities, and communication mediated by technologies inherently increase the risk of interactions between people, and decrease the informal relationship-building possibilities fostering trust in co-located environments.

It takes conscious leadership behaviors to create the disposition to allow trust in a distributed context through vulnerability-based trust. This is unlike competence-based trust, in which members of a team show that they can be genuinely fallible, and can create a vulnerability-based trust, in which team members are open to making mistakes and to enlisting assistance without concern about being judged or adversely affected [7]. Such trust must be built in a distributed context by deliberate investments in relationship building that go beyond task-oriented interactions and include organized time to get to know each other, visible modeling of vulnerability by executives, and recurrent reactions to risk-taking that reward safety instead of punishment. Some of these practices are opening meetings by personal check-in, which makes people human versus professional, setting team norms that make it clear that learning is better than blame in the event of initiative failure, and providing ways that make issues feel too risky to bring to open forums. Leaders who develop vulnerability-based trust understand that distributed teams demand a higher frequency and explicitness of trust information than co-located teams because, in the former case, trust does not arise naturally when people are not communicating informally in the hallway or having impromptu moments in relationships.

The collective accountability models based on stakeholder engagement models are an important infrastructure in shared ownership in complex program environments. Conventional stakeholder outreach usually makes program managers act as agents who mediate between the expectations of the business and the delivery groups, ultimately developing dependency networks that compromise the autonomy of teams and degrade accountability [8]. Other models feature direct, stakeholder-team contact via frequently recurring collaborative team sessions wherein priorities are negotiated openly, trade-offs are discussed openly, and delivery teams gain intimate knowledge of business context and customer requirements. These patterns of engagement spread accountability throughout the value chain instead of accumulating it within program management functions, encouraging the shared ownership of results. In multi-vendor setups, shared accountability models have to maneuver between contractual space and competing organizational goals, necessitating clear governance frameworks to inspire incentives in terms of overall success as opposed to optimization of individual vendors.

In an effort by program managers to act as cultural architects, patterns of interaction modeling are designed to support collaboration through organizational complexity. This role in architecture goes beyond the conventional coordination roles to include deliberate influence on the manner in which teams interact, make decisions, conflict resolution mechanisms, and celebrate achievements [8]. Cultural architects set up patterns of engagement that create relational capacity, design meeting patterns that create equilibrium between efficiency and inclusion, and form feedback loops that reveal collaboration friction early enough. They understand that sustainable cooperation is an engaged process with well-planned systems and not superhuman efforts, and that it needs to be attended to continuously to provide the social infrastructure of technical provision.

Table 3: Neurological and Behavioral Foundations of Psychological Safety in Agile Teams [7, 8]

Component	Mechanism and Characteristics	Impact on Team Performance
Threat Response Activation	Perceived threats to social status, independence, or belonging trigger amygdala-driven fight-or-flight responses that disrupt prefrontal cortex activity	Cognitive resources are diverted to self-protection rather than innovation, suppressing information sharing, experimentation, and dissenting views
Collective Intelligence Enhancement	Psychologically safe environments enable full cognitive engagement without defensive resource allocation	Teams demonstrate higher collective intelligence, earlier issue identification, and superior adaptive response to emerging challenges

Distributed Team Vulnerability	Physical distance, cultural disparities, and technology-mediated communication inherently increase interpersonal interaction risks	Reduced informal relationship-building opportunities that naturally foster trust in co-located environments, requiring deliberate safety investments
Vulnerability-Based Trust	Team members openly acknowledge fallibility and seek assistance without fear of judgment or adverse consequences	Creates a foundation for genuine collaboration and risk-taking, contrasting with competence-based trust that may inhibit authentic problem disclosure
Trust Signal Frequency	Distributed teams require higher frequency and explicitness of trust-building communications than co-located teams	Compensates for the absence of informal hallway conversations and impromptu relationship moments that naturally build trust in physical proximity

5. Towards a Human-centered Model of Enterprise Agility

The synthesis of the results of servant leadership and cross-cultural relations, as well as psychological safety, demonstrates a great interdependence of these human aspects to define the results of the transformations. Leadership practices create the cultural terms under which teams should work, whereas cultural norms shape the pattern in which psychological safety is manifested and realized in various contexts. In those cases where the servants do not provide any obstacles and instead nurture autonomy, permissive environments are thus created where vulnerability-based trust may be built up, yet the functionality of such leadership actions is inherently connected with cultural preparedness to adopt non-hierarchical authority relations [9]. Equally, the psychological safety facilitates the free communication and joint solution-finding assumed by the Agile methodologies; safety in itself is only achieved when the leadership establishes a continuous reinforcement of learning-driven reactions to failure and works together with a culture that promotes an open dialogue. This interdependence implies that only fragmented interventions involving single dimensions will produce minimal results, whereas integrated interventions that build leadership capabilities, cultural norms, and safety conditions produce mutually strengthening forces that give the momentum of transformations and sustainability across enterprise systems.

Practical implications of Agile transformations at scale into organizations state that human infrastructure investment needs to be carried out with the same level of seriousness that is given to process and technical. The development of cultural intelligence in Agile coaches and program managers based on immersion in cross-cultural experiences and reflective practice should be the priority of organizations instead of superficial awareness training [9]. The leadership development programs should clearly foster servant leadership abilities, such as active listening, systems thinking, and facilitative intervention qualities that vary significantly, as compared to conventional management skills. Psychological safety is an outcome of measurable transformation that should be implemented by organizations, and regular climate surveys of a team and the accountability of leaders to provide an environment in which team members feel safe to speak, experiment, and admit to errors. The governance systems should be redesigned to accommodate distributed debate and collective accountability to shift the control mechanisms to transparency-based coordination mechanisms. Resource allocation models need to appreciate that collaborative capacity and trust development among distributed teams requires long-term investment in relationship-development efforts, formalized knowledge sharing, and forums where collaborative problem solving is supplanted by short-term productivity indicators, but are essential in achieving transformation success in the long term.

The drawbacks of this exploration and the future directions of research are a recognition of the limit on current knowledge that simultaneously establishes avenues of inquiry with potential. The analysis is mainly based on the software development contexts, so that the transferability to other non-technical areas where the Agile adoption is being applied more and more often may be questioned [10]. Future studies need to investigate the extent to which the human-centered transformation dynamics are different between various

sectors of the industry, companies of varying sizes, and regulatory frameworks with varying limitations on autonomy and experimentation. Long-term studies on the transformation paths would enlighten the development of leadership, culture, and psychological safety in different stages of maturity and the impact of early investments in human aspects on future results. A comparative study of the methods of transformation in the various national cultures may indicate whether there are universal principles or whether the success of strategies used greatly depends upon the culture. Quantitative studies that show a causal relationship between certain leadership behaviors, cultural interventions, and transformation outcomes would reinforce the evidence that practitioners use to make investment decisions.

Concluding remarks underline the idea that the enduring change needs a long-term focus on the human factor as opposed to the short-term interventions (through structural changes) only. Agile changes end in success or failure depending on whether individuals at organizational levels accept new patterns of operation, create teamwork and adaptability abilities, and persist amidst setbacks and unpredictabilities [10]. This anthropocentric view places change as continuous cultural change and not as a discrete project with specific boundaries that demand perpetual leadership attention to foster psychological safety, cross-cultural bridging, and servant leadership modeling that fosters a sense of ownership and excellence in collaborative effort throughout the complexity of the enterprise.

Table 4: Interdependencies of Human Dimensions in Agile Transformation Success [9, 10]

Human Dimension	Interconnected Relationships	Transformation Implications
Servant Leadership and Culture	Leadership practices create cultural conditions for team operation, while cultural norms shape receptiveness to non-hierarchical authority relations	Impediment removal and autonomy nurturing create environments for vulnerability-based trust only when cultural readiness exists to embrace distributed authority
Psychological Safety and Leadership	Safety enables open communication and collaborative problem-solving while requiring continuous leadership reinforcement of learning-oriented failure responses	Psychological safety outcomes depend on leaders establishing consistent reactions that reward transparency and experimentation rather than punishing mistakes
Cultural Norms and Safety Expression	Cultural contexts determine how psychological safety manifests and is experienced across different geographical and organizational settings	Safety interventions must align with cultural expectations for dialogue openness and hierarchical challenge acceptability to achieve intended effects
Integrated Intervention Approach	Single-dimension interventions produce suboptimal results, while integrated approaches, building leadership capabilities, cultural norms, and safety conditions, create mutually reinforcing dynamics	Holistic interventions generate momentum and sustainability across enterprise systems rather than fragmented outcomes from isolated initiatives
Human-Technical Infrastructure Balance	Human infrastructure investment requires equal rigor as process and tooling implementations to support sustainable transformation	Organizations must prioritize cultural intelligence development, servant leadership capabilities, and psychological safety measurement alongside technical and process changes

Conclusion

The human aspects of organizational Agile transformations show that a sustainable organizational change does not rely on the implementation of structures alone but must involve a radical redefinition of leadership, culture, and collaborative infrastructure in dispersed global environments. The interdependence of servant leadership practices, cross-cultural intelligence, and the psychological safety mechanisms shows that uncoordinated interventions that focus on separate dimensions generate fewer change results, whereas the coordinated interventions that build all these human capabilities generate synergistic processes that facilitate quicker adoption and implant cultural change. Companies that are making Agile transformations at scale need to make the critically important investment of human infrastructure through leadership development programs, developing facilitative competencies, cultural intelligence training, providing immersive cross-cultural experiences, and governance redesign that creates psychological safety as quantifiable results with leader accountability. The fact of a multi-vendor and multi-country program environment has been proven to be supported by solution providers who deliberately develop patterns of interaction, trans-cultural differences, and vulnerability-based trust patterns of distributed teams so that they can realize collaborative excellence in spite of the geographical dispersion and organizational complexity. The opportunities for future research that can be identified are longitudinal studies following the changes of human dimensions in the course of the stages of transformation maturity, comparative analysis to determine whether there are universal principles in different cultures, and quantitative research to find causal relationships between the given leadership behaviors and the results of transformation. This humanistic approach ultimately places Agile transformation not as a limited project with established boundaries but as a continuous process of cultural change that needs a consistent focus on leadership on fostering psychological safety, respecting cultural diversity, and motivating shared ownership that maintains collaborative skills and adaptive capacity needed in the face of increasing change, growing complexity, and more intense competitive demands that demand continuous innovation and customer-oriented value provision.

References

[1] Maria Paasivaara et al., "Large-scale agile transformation at Ericsson: a case study," Springer Nature Link. 2018. [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10664-017-9555-8

[2] Stephen Denning and Gary Hamel, "The Age of Agile: How Smart Companies Are Transforming the Way Work Gets Done," Goodreads, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/34963438-the-age-of-agile

[3] Rashina Hoda and James. Noble, "Becoming agile: a grounded theory of agile transitions in practice," in Proc. 39th Int. Conf. Software Engineering, Buenos Aires, Argentina, May 2017, pp. 141-151. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318576089_Becoming_Agile_A_Grounded_Theory_of_Agile_Transitions_in_Practice

[4] Kim Dikert et al., "Challenges and success factors for large-scale agile transformations: A systematic literature review," Journal of Systems and Software, Volume 119, September 2016, Pages 87-108. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0164121216300826

[5] Emam Hossain et al., "Using Scrum in Global Software Development: A Systematic Literature Review," in Proc. 4th IEEE Int. Conf. Global Software Engineering, Limerick, Ireland, Jul. 2009, pp. 175-184. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5196931

[6] Rafael Prikladnicki et al., "Distributed Software Development: Practices and challenges in different business strategies of offshoring and onshoring," IEEE, 2007. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4299862/footnotes#footnotes

[7] PETER J. DENNING et al., "The Innovator's Way: Essential Practices for Successful Innovation," Communications of the ACM, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 61-68, Apr. 2010. [Online]. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hhgbn

[8] Kieran Conboy et al., "Implementing Large-Scale Agile Frameworks: Challenges and Recommendations," IEEE, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8648270

[9] Torgeir Dingsøyr et al., "A decade of agile methodologies: Towards explaining agile software development," Journal of Systems and Software, Volume 85, Issue 6, June 2012, Pages 1213-1221. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0164121212000532
[10] Nils Brede Moe et al., "A teamwork model for understanding an agile team: A case study of a Scrum project," Information and Software Technology, Volume 52, Issue 5, May 2010, Pages 480-491, 2010. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0950584909002043