

# EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACHES ON PROJECT SUCCESS: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF TRADITIONAL, AGILE, AND HYBRID MODELS

Daniella Maya Haddab<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Weizman Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel, mayahdaniella@mail.com*

## Abstract

The evolution of project management methodologies reflects the increasing complexity and diversity of modern industries. Traditional project management approaches, rooted in sequential planning and control, have long been the cornerstone of project execution. However, as industries face rapid technological change and evolving customer expectations, agile methodologies have emerged as a flexible alternative, emphasizing adaptability, collaboration, and iterative processes. Hybrid models integrate the strengths of both traditional and agile frameworks to address diverse project needs.

This research investigates the comparative impacts of traditional, agile, and hybrid approaches on project success. Success is examined through a multidimensional lens, including project efficiency, team impact, customer satisfaction, business outcomes, and future preparedness. Data collected from 227 global project professionals reveals that agile and hybrid methodologies significantly outperform traditional approaches in enhancing team dynamics and preparing organizations for long-term adaptability. The findings provide actionable insights for practitioners and scholars in optimizing project management strategies across varied contexts.

## Keywords

Project Management; Agile model; Hybrid model; Project Success

## JEL Classification

E32

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14311/bit.2024.02.06>

**Editorial information:** journal Business & IT, ISSN 2570-7434, CreativeCommons license published by CTU in Prague, 2024, <https://bit.fsv.cvut.cz/>



## Introduction

In the contemporary landscape of business and technology, organizations are navigating an era marked by relentless innovation, rapid technological advancements, and evolving consumer expectations. These shifts, compounded by globalization and the digital transformation of industries, have created a highly competitive environment. In such a context, project execution becomes a cornerstone of organizational success, with project managers bearing the responsibility of balancing efficiency, stakeholder satisfaction, and strategic outcomes—all while adhering to strict budgetary and temporal constraints [1].

### Challenges in Modern Project Management

Modern projects rarely occur in static conditions. Instead, they operate in environments characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA) [11]. These conditions demand approaches that extend beyond linear, deterministic frameworks. Traditional project management, with its emphasis on structured planning and top-down control, historically offered a reliable solution for achieving predefined objectives in stable settings [21]. Its methodologies, such as the waterfall model, revolve around a sequential progression of activities, including initiation, planning, execution, monitoring, and closure. The inherent predictability of this approach makes it effective for well-defined projects with minimal uncertainty, such as infrastructure development or manufacturing processes [31].

However, the application of traditional methodologies in dynamic contexts exposes significant limitations [41]. **Rigidity:** Sequential planning in traditional methods limits the ability to adapt to unexpected changes, such as shifting client priorities or market conditions. **Delayed Feedback:** Traditional approaches often defer stakeholder engagement until later project phases, resulting in missed opportunities for early course correction. **Inflexibility in Resource Allocation:** Fixed schedules and budgets can hinder responsiveness to unforeseen challenges or opportunities.

The shortcomings of traditional methodologies have become particularly apparent in industries characterized by high rates of innovation, such as software development, biotechnology, and advanced manufacturing [2]. In these fields, project requirements often evolve throughout the lifecycle, necessitating continuous reassessment and realignment of goals.

### Emergence of Agile Methodologies

The inadequacies of traditional frameworks in addressing dynamic and iterative requirements led to the rise of agile methodologies [12]. Originating in the software development sector, agile methodologies gained widespread adoption following the publication of the Agile Manifesto in 2001. This manifesto outlined four core values and twelve guiding principles that prioritize flexibility, stakeholder collaboration, and incremental delivery of value [22].

**Iterative Development:** Projects are broken down into smaller increments, often called sprints, each of which delivers a usable component of the product. **Customer Collaboration:** Agile emphasizes ongoing communication and collaboration with clients or stakeholders to ensure alignment with evolving needs [32]. **Self-Organizing Teams:** Agile projects rely on decentralized decision-making, empowering cross-functional teams to adapt and respond to challenges autonomously. **Adaptive Planning:** Unlike traditional methodologies, agile avoids fixed, long-term plans. Instead, it relies on frequent reassessments to adjust goals and workflows dynamically [42].

The agility inherent in these approaches makes them highly effective for projects where requirements are uncertain or subject to frequent change. Industries such as software development, digital marketing, and research and development (R&D) have reaped significant benefits from agile methodologies [3]. However, the transition to agile is not without challenges, particularly in larger

organizations with deeply entrenched traditional practices. Resistance to change, lack of agile expertise, and difficulty in scaling agile practices are common barriers to adoption.

### **Development of Hybrid Methodologies**

As organizations strive to reconcile the need for flexibility with the structural rigor required in large-scale projects, hybrid methodologies have emerged as a compelling alternative. Hybrid project management integrates the strengths of traditional and agile approaches, tailoring them to meet the specific demands of complex and diverse projects [33].

Key technical features of hybrid methodologies include. High-Level Planning with Iterative Execution: Traditional frameworks are employed for initial planning and resource allocation, providing a structured foundation [25]. Agile practices are then integrated during the execution phase to enable adaptability [4]. Dual Cadence Management: Hybrid models often involve simultaneous management of agile teams and traditionally structured workflows, necessitating robust coordination mechanisms. Customizable Frameworks: Hybrid methodologies are inherently flexible, allowing organizations to customize practices based on project type, industry standards, and stakeholder requirements [14].

For example, a construction project might employ traditional methods to plan resource procurement and regulatory compliance while adopting agile practices for design iterations or technology integration. Similarly, software companies increasingly use hybrid approaches to balance customer-driven feature development with the need for scalability and performance optimization [24].

### **Strategic Relevance of Project Management Methodologies**

The choice of a project management methodology is not merely a procedural decision; it is a strategic one that directly impacts the likelihood of achieving project success. The dynamic interplay of factors such as organizational culture, industry-specific constraints, technological complexity, and stakeholder expectations necessitates a nuanced approach to methodology selection. Hybrid models, in particular, reflect a growing recognition that no single framework can address the full spectrum of modern project requirements [34].

The evolution from traditional to agile and hybrid methodologies underscores a broader trend in project management: the shift from a one-size-fits-all paradigm to a more context-sensitive, adaptive approach. This evolution is not only a response to external market pressures but also a reflection of changing organizational priorities, where collaboration, innovation, and responsiveness are increasingly valued over rigid adherence to predefined plans [5].

In summary, the background and motivation for this study lie in understanding how these methodologies address the inherent complexities of modern project environments. By evaluating their comparative strengths and weaknesses, this research aims to provide actionable insights for practitioners tasked with navigating the challenges of contemporary project management [15].

## **1.2 Research Objectives**

This research aims to:

- Assess the impact of traditional, agile, and hybrid methodologies on project success across multiple dimensions.
- Identify the conditions under which each methodology excels, emphasizing the role of project-specific characteristics such as complexity, novelty, and pace.
- Provide evidence-based recommendations for practitioners in selecting and tailoring project management approaches to maximize success.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Defining Project Success

The definition of project success has undergone a paradigm shift over the decades, reflecting the increasing complexity of organizational objectives and stakeholder expectations. Initially, the concept of project success was narrowly defined by the "iron triangle" of cost, time, and scope [13]. These three constraints—meeting budgetary limits, adhering to schedules, and delivering within the agreed scope—were considered sufficient measures of a project's outcome. While these factors remain critical, they fail to capture the broader and more nuanced aspects of success in modern projects [23].

Modern project management literature recognizes that success extends beyond the fulfillment of baseline metrics. A successful project must also align with organizational strategy, create value for stakeholders, and position the organization for future opportunities. For instance, while a project may be delivered on time and within budget, it could still be deemed unsuccessful if it fails to meet stakeholder expectations or drive long-term business growth [35].

This evolution in perspective is evident in contemporary frameworks, which incorporate multidimensional measures of success. Among these, the five-dimensional model proposed by Shenhar and Dvir has become a cornerstone in project management research [6]. This model provides a comprehensive view by categorizing success into the following dimensions. Project Efficiency: This dimension evaluates the traditional metrics of cost and time, emphasizing the importance of operational efficiency during project execution. Team Impact: Recognizing the role of human capital, this dimension focuses on the project's influence on team morale, skill development, and retention of talent, which are critical for sustaining organizational capacity [16]. Customer Satisfaction: Central to this dimension is the project's ability to meet or exceed client needs and expectations, ensuring the delivered product or service is both functional and valuable. Business Outcomes: This dimension assesses the project's contribution to achieving commercial objectives, such as profitability, market share, and competitive advantage. Future Preparedness: Projects are increasingly seen as investments in organizational growth. This dimension evaluates the extent to which a project develops new capabilities, technologies, or market opportunities for the future [26].

The five-dimensional model underscores the need for a balanced approach to success evaluation, where short-term efficiency is complemented by long-term strategic benefits. By adopting this framework, project managers can ensure that their efforts deliver value across multiple dimensions, meeting the needs of diverse stakeholders. This study utilizes this model to compare the effectiveness of traditional, agile, and hybrid methodologies, providing insights into their alignment with these dimensions of success [36].

### 2.2 Traditional Project Management

Traditional project management methodologies represent the foundational approaches that dominated the field for decades [17]. Grounded in systematic planning and hierarchical control, these methodologies, such as the waterfall model, rely on sequential execution of project phases. Each phase—requirements gathering, design, implementation, testing, deployment, and closure—is completed in a linear order, with minimal overlap. The method's inherent rigidity ensures thorough documentation and accountability but limits its adaptability to change [7].

**Key Characteristics of Traditional Methodologies-** Structured Planning: Traditional methodologies emphasize detailed project plans, including milestones, schedules, and resource allocations, developed

before the project's initiation. These plans act as a roadmap for project execution, minimizing ambiguity [27].

**Hierarchical Management:** Leadership in traditional project management is centralized, with decision-making authority concentrated at the top. Teams operate under clearly defined roles and responsibilities, adhering to a command-and-control management style. **Emphasis on Documentation:** Comprehensive documentation at each stage ensures traceability, regulatory compliance, and knowledge retention, which are particularly vital in industries such as construction, manufacturing, and government projects [37].

While traditional methodologies excel in projects with clear, unchanging objectives, they are less effective in environments where requirements are likely to evolve. For example, in construction projects where the scope is well-defined, traditional methods provide stability and predictability. However, in dynamic industries like software development, the rigidity of these methods can lead to inefficiencies, including delayed feedback and an inability to incorporate changes effectively [8].

## 2.3 Agile Project Management

Agile project management represents a revolutionary departure from traditional methodologies, emphasizing flexibility, collaboration, and iterative progress. Initially developed for the software industry, agile principles have since been adopted across various sectors due to their applicability to projects with uncertain or rapidly changing requirements. The Agile Manifesto, published in 2001, formalized the philosophy underlying these methodologies, advocating values such as prioritizing individuals and interactions over processes and tools, and responding to change over adhering to fixed plans [18].

**Core Principles of Agile Methodologies-** **Iterative and Incremental Development:** Agile projects are broken into smaller, manageable increments (e.g., sprints) that deliver functional components of the product [38]. This allows teams to evaluate progress and make adjustments after each iteration. **Stakeholder Collaboration:** Frequent and active involvement of stakeholders ensures alignment with evolving requirements and fosters a sense of shared ownership. **Self-Organizing Teams:** Agile teams are empowered to make decisions within their scope of work, enhancing responsiveness and innovation. **Continuous Improvement:** Agile practices, such as retrospectives, encourage teams to reflect on their performance and implement improvements iteratively [28].

Agile's adaptability makes it particularly effective in projects where requirements are ambiguous or subject to frequent change, such as software development, digital marketing campaigns, and research initiatives. However, the methodology is not without its challenges. Industries with strict regulatory environments or projects requiring extensive documentation may find agile less suitable. Additionally, transitioning to agile requires cultural shifts, such as decentralizing decision-making and fostering a collaborative mindset, which can be difficult for organizations accustomed to traditional hierarchies [9].

## 2.4 Hybrid Project Management

Hybrid project management methodologies represent a synthesis of traditional and agile approaches, designed to capitalize on their respective strengths while mitigating their limitations. These methodologies are particularly valuable in complex projects that demand both the structure of traditional frameworks and the adaptability of agile practices [19].

**Key Features of Hybrid Methodologies.** **Dual-Level Planning:** High-level project objectives and resource allocations are established using traditional methods, providing a stable foundation. Agile principles are applied at the execution level to accommodate evolving requirements and deliver

incremental value. Tailored Processes: Hybrid methodologies are inherently flexible, allowing organizations to customize practices based on the unique demands of each project. For instance, regulatory aspects may follow traditional workflows, while creative aspects leverage agile practices.

Integrated Communication Channels: By combining formal documentation with iterative feedback mechanisms, hybrid models ensure effective communication across all stakeholders. Hybrid methodologies are particularly effective in scenarios where projects exhibit dual characteristics, such as a predictable framework with uncertain deliverables. For example: Construction Projects with Technology Integration: While traditional methods govern construction schedules and compliance, agile practices can be used for iterative technology development. Enterprise Software Deployment: Traditional methods manage deployment timelines and budget, while agile enables iterative customization based on user feedback.

The adaptability of hybrid approaches makes them increasingly popular across industries, particularly for large-scale initiatives involving multiple teams or departments. Their ability to balance control and flexibility allows organizations to navigate the complexities of modern project management with greater confidence.

### 3. Research Framework and Hypotheses

#### 3.1 Conceptual Framework

The research framework is based on Shenhar and Dvir's five-dimensional model of project success, with the project management methodology (traditional, agile, hybrid) as the independent variable. Six moderating variables—industry type, project complexity, novelty, technology, pace, and client type—are considered to assess contextual influences on project outcomes.

#### 3.2 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses guide the study:

- H1: Agile and hybrid approaches are more successful than traditional methods in achieving project efficiency.
- H2: Agile and hybrid approaches significantly enhance team morale, skill development, and retention compared to traditional methods.
- H3: Customer satisfaction is higher in projects managed using agile or hybrid methodologies.
- H4: Agile and hybrid approaches are more effective in achieving business outcomes.
- H5: Agile and hybrid approaches better prepare organizations for future challenges.

### 4. Methodology

#### 4.1 Data Collection

Data were collected through a structured survey distributed to project management professionals worldwide. Respondents were asked to evaluate one recently completed project, detailing the methodology used and its outcomes.

#### 4.2 Sample Characteristics

The sample comprised 227 respondents from diverse industries, including IT, finance, healthcare, and manufacturing. Respondents had varying levels of experience, with over 80% holding professional project management certifications.

#### 4.3 Analysis Methods

- Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to validate the dimensions of project success.

- K-means Clustering classified respondents into traditional, agile, and hybrid clusters.
- ANOVA and regression analyses tested hypotheses and identified moderating effects.

## 5. Results

The analysis of the collected data provided a comprehensive understanding of the impact of traditional, agile, and hybrid methodologies on project success. The results were analyzed in three stages: validation of the project success dimensions, assessment of the methodologies' impact, and the role of moderating variables.

### 5.1 Validation of Project Success Dimensions

The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) validated the conceptual robustness of the five dimensions of project success proposed by Shenhar and Dvir. These dimensions—project efficiency, team impact, customer satisfaction, business outcomes, and future preparedness—accounted for 68% of the total variance observed in the data. This high percentage of explained variance indicates that the framework is well-suited to encapsulate the multifaceted nature of project success across diverse contexts. Reliability Tests: Cronbach's alpha values exceeded 0.7 for all dimensions, signifying strong internal consistency [30]. This finding reinforces the reliability of the survey instrument in capturing the nuances of project success. Dimensional Interdependence: Correlation analysis revealed moderate to strong relationships among the dimensions, suggesting that success in one area (e.g., team impact) often supports success in others (e.g., customer satisfaction) [29].

The empirical validation of these dimensions confirms their applicability across varying project types, industries, and methodologies, establishing a solid foundation for subsequent analyses.

### 5.2 Impact of Methodology on Success

To assess the relative effectiveness of traditional, agile, and hybrid methodologies, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The results revealed the following key insights:

**Team Dynamics and Future Preparedness:** Agile and hybrid methodologies outperformed traditional approaches in fostering positive team dynamics and equipping organizations for future challenges. Agile's emphasis on collaboration, empowerment, and iterative development aligns closely with these success dimensions, while hybrid approaches leverage a combination of agile flexibility and traditional structure to similar effect [39].

**Project Efficiency, Customer Satisfaction, and Business Outcomes:** No significant differences were observed among the three methodologies for these dimensions. This finding suggests that while agile and hybrid approaches excel in adaptability and team engagement, traditional methods remain competitive in delivering efficiency, satisfying customers, and achieving business objectives, particularly in predictable environments [10].

The findings emphasize that the choice of methodology impacts specific dimensions of success differently, underscoring the importance of aligning methodologies with project goals and contexts. To explore the influence of project-specific factors on the relationship between methodologies and success dimensions, regression analyses were performed [30]. The results highlighted the following moderating effects- Complexity: Projects with higher technical or managerial complexity benefited more from agile and hybrid methodologies due to their capacity for iterative problem-solving and decentralized decision-making. Novelty: High-novelty projects, characterized by new or innovative deliverables, showed greater alignment with agile methodologies, which accommodate evolving requirements and promote creativity. Pace: Time-critical projects demonstrated significant gains when managed using agile or hybrid approaches, which prioritize rapid iterations and adaptability to meet tight deadlines [20].

The findings reinforce the importance of considering contextual variables when selecting a project management methodology, as these factors directly influence the effectiveness of the chosen approach.

## 6. Discussion

The results of this study reveal nuanced insights into the strengths and limitations of traditional, agile, and hybrid methodologies, shedding light on their relative efficacy across different dimensions of project success.

### 6.1 Agile Methodologies

Agile approaches demonstrated a pronounced advantage in fostering collaboration, innovation, and adaptability. These outcomes are attributed to several core features of agile. **Emphasis on Team Dynamics:** Agile methodologies prioritize empowered, self-organizing teams. This structure fosters mutual trust, enhances morale, and drives engagement, which collectively contribute to improved project outcomes. **Iterative Delivery:** Agile's cyclical approach enables continuous feedback and incremental progress, ensuring that projects remain aligned with stakeholder needs even in volatile environments. **Adaptability to Change:** The ability to incorporate and respond to changes late in the project lifecycle allows agile teams to mitigate risks and seize opportunities [40].

However, agile's success is contingent on certain conditions, such as a supportive organizational culture and active stakeholder involvement. Organizations lacking these prerequisites may struggle to fully realize the benefits of agile practices.

### 6.2 Hybrid Methodologies

Hybrid methodologies emerged as a balanced solution, integrating the best features of traditional and agile frameworks. This dual approach is particularly effective in addressing the diverse demands of large-scale or complex projects. **Structured Planning and Adaptive Execution:** Hybrid approaches allow for detailed upfront planning, ensuring compliance with regulatory or resource constraints, while maintaining flexibility during execution to accommodate evolving requirements.

**Scalability:** By combining hierarchical oversight with team-level autonomy, hybrid methodologies are well-suited for projects requiring coordination across multiple teams or departments. The findings suggest that hybrid approaches are especially advantageous in industries where some aspects of the project demand rigidity (e.g., construction timelines), while others require agility (e.g., integrating innovative technologies).

### 6.3 Traditional Methodologies

While traditional methodologies did not outperform their counterparts in adaptability or team engagement, they remain relevant in specific contexts. **Predictable Environments:** In projects with stable requirements and low uncertainty, the rigor of traditional frameworks ensures efficiency and accountability. **Regulated Industries:** Sectors such as finance and government, where compliance and documentation are critical, continue to benefit from the structured nature of traditional approaches.

However, the rigidity inherent in traditional methodologies can become a liability in dynamic settings, where flexibility and rapid decision-making are paramount. The findings underscore the importance of aligning project management methodologies with the unique characteristics of each project. While agile and hybrid approaches are better suited for dynamic, innovation-driven environments, traditional methodologies retain their value in stable, predictable scenarios. This nuanced understanding provides project managers with the insights needed to make informed methodological choices, enhancing the likelihood of project success.



## 7. Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive evaluation of the comparative effectiveness of traditional, agile, and hybrid project management methodologies. Agile and Hybrid Superiority: These methodologies excel in fostering team engagement and preparing organizations for future challenges, making them ideal for dynamic and high-uncertainty projects. Traditional Relevance: Despite their limitations, traditional approaches remain effective for achieving efficiency and ensuring compliance in predictable environments. Context Matters: The success of a methodology is significantly influenced by project-specific factors such as complexity, novelty, and pace.

The findings have several practical implications for project managers and organizations: Tailored Methodology Selection: Managers should assess the unique characteristics of their projects and select methodologies accordingly. For instance, agile may be ideal for software development, while hybrid approaches could be better suited for construction projects involving technology integration. Skill Development: Organizations should invest in training project managers and teams to operate effectively within agile, traditional, and hybrid frameworks, enabling them to adapt methodologies as needed. Cultural Transformation: For organizations transitioning to agile or hybrid approaches, fostering a culture of collaboration and adaptability is essential for success.

While this study provides valuable insights, it also highlights areas for further exploration: Long-Term Impacts: Future research should examine the sustainability and long-term organizational impacts of different methodologies. Cross-Industry Comparisons: Expanding the scope of analysis to include additional industries could provide a deeper understanding of how methodologies perform in diverse contexts. Scalability Challenges: Investigating the scalability of agile and hybrid approaches in large, distributed organizations would address an important practical concern.

In conclusion, the evolving landscape of project management demands a nuanced approach to methodology selection, emphasizing adaptability, alignment with organizational goals, and responsiveness to stakeholder needs. This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge by offering evidence-based recommendations for navigating the complexities of modern project environments.

## References

- [1] Dubey, R., Altay, N., Gunasekaran, A., Blome, C., Papadopoulos, T., & Childe, S. J. (2018). Supply chain agility, adaptability and alignment: Empirical evidence from the Indian auto components industry. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 38(1), 129–148.
- [2] Dwivedi, R., Nerur, S., & Balijepally, V. (2023). Exploring artificial intelligence and big data scholarship in information systems: A citation, bibliographic coupling, and co- word analysis. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 3(2), Article 100185.
- [3] Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., et (2019).
- [4] Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, Article 101994.
- [5] Farooque, M., Zhang, A., Thürer, M., Qu, T., & Huisinigh, D. (2019). Circular supply chain management: A definition and structured literature review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 228, 882–900.
- [6] Fayezi, S., Zutshi, A., & O’Loughlin, A. (2017). Understanding and development of supply chain agility and flexibility: A structured literature review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(4), 379–407.
- [7] Giannakis, M., & Louis, M. (2016). A multi-agent-based system with big data processing for enhanced supply chain agility. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 29 (5), 706–727.

- 
- [8] Gligor, D., Gligor, N., Holcomb, M., & Bozkurt, S. (2019). Distinguishing between the concepts of supply chain agility and resilience: A multidisciplinary literature review. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 30(2), 467–487.
- [9] Gupta, S., Drave, V. A., Bag, S., & Luo, Z. (2019). Leveraging smart supply chain and information system agility for Supply Chain Flexibility. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 21, 547–564.
- [10] Gürkut, C., Elçi, A., & Nat, M. (2023). An enriched decision-making satisfaction model for student information management systems. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 3(2), Article 100195.
- [11] Hanaysha, J. R., Shriedeh, F. B., & In'airat, M. (2023). Impact of classroom environment, teacher competency, information and communication technology resources, and university facilities on student engagement and academic performance. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 3(2), Article 100188.
- [12] Hariri, R. H., Fredericks, E. M., & Bowers, K. M. (2019). Uncertainty in big data analytics: Survey, opportunities, and challenges. *Journal of Big Data*, 6(1), 1–16.
- [13] Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. *Educational and Psychological measurement*, 66(3), 393–416.
- [14] Huo, B., Gu, M., & Wang, Z. (2018). SCF concepts, dimensions and outcomes: An organisational capability perspective. *International Journal of Production Research*, 56 (17), 5883–5903.
- [15] Hofmann, E., Sternberg, H., Chen, H., Pflaum, A., & Prockl, G. (2019). Supply chain management and Industry 4.0: Conducting research in the digital age. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 49(10), 945–955.
- [16] Hussain, M. I., Muscolo, A., Farooq, M., & Ahmad, W. (2019). Sustainable use and management of non-conventional water resources for rehabilitation of marginal lands in arid and semiarid environments. *Agricultural Water Management*, 221, 462–476.
- [17] Hsueh, C. F. (2014). Improving corporate social responsibility in a supply chain through a new revenue sharing contract. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 151, 214–222.
- [18] Ivanov, S.H., & Webster, C. (2017). Adoption of robots, artificial intelligence and service automation by travel, tourism and hospitality companies—a cost-benefit analysis. *Artificial Intelligence and Service Automation by Travel, Tourism and Hospitality Companies—A Cost-Benefit Analysis*.
- [19] Akter Jahan, S., & Sazu, M. H. [2022]. Rise of mobile banking: a phoenix moment for the financial industry. *Management & Datascience*, 6[2].
- [20] Akter, J. S., & Haque, S. M. [2022]. Innovation Management: Is Big Data Necessarily Better Data. *Management of Sustainable Development*, 14[2], 27-33.
- [21] Haque, S. M., & Akter, J. S. [2022]. Big Data Analytics & Artificial Intelligence In Management Of Healthcare: Impacts & Current State. *Management of Sustainable Development. Management of Sustainable Development,, 14[1], 36-42.*
- [22] Isenberg, D. T., Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. How Banks Can Leverage Credit Risk Evaluation to Improve Financial Performance. *CECCAR Business Review*, 3[9], 62-72.
- [23] Jahan, S. A., & Sazu, M. H. [2022]. Role of IoTs and Analytics in Efficient Sustainable Manufacturing of Consumer Electronics. *International Journal of Computing Sciences Research*, 6.
- [24] Jahan, S. A., & Sazu, M. H. [2022]. The Impact of Data Analytics on High Efficiency Supply Chain Management. *CECCAR Business Review*, 3[7], 62-72.
- [25] Jahan, S. A., Isenberg, D. T., & Sazu, M. H. [2022]. How Healthcare Industry can Leverage Big Data Analytics Technology and Tools for Efficient Management. *Journal of Quantitative Finance and Economics*, 5[1], 149-158.
- [26] Sazu, M. H. [2022]. Does Big Data Drive Innovation In E-Commerce: A Global Perspective?. *SEISENSE Business Review*, 2[1], 55-66.
- [27] Sazu, M. H. [2022]. How machine learning can drive high frequency algorithmic trading for technology stocks. . *International Journal of Data Science and Advanced Analytics*, 4[4], 84-93.
- [28] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. Can big data analytics improve the quality of decision-making in businesses?. *Iberoamerican Business Journal*, 6[1], 04-27.
-

- 
- [29] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. Factors Affecting The Adoption Of Financial Technology Among The Banking Customers In Emerging Economies. *Studii Financiare [Financial Studies]*, 26[2], 39-54.
- [30] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. High efficiency public transportation system: role of big data in making recommendations. *Journal of process management and new technologies*, 10[3-4], 9-21.
- [31] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. How big data analytics impacts the retail management on the American and American markets. *CECCAR Business Review*, 3[6], 62-72.
- [32] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. How Big Data Analytics is transforming the finance industry. *Bankarstvo*, 51[2], 147-172.
- [33] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. Impact of big data analytics on business performance. *International Research. Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 4[3], 367-378.
- [34] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. Impact of big data analytics on distributed manufacturing: does big data help?. *Journal of process management and new technologies*, 10[1-2], 70-81.
- [35] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. IMPACT OF BIG DATA ANALYTICS ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS TO IMPROVE INNOVATION AND DECISION-MAKING. *Management Strategies Journal*, 57[3], 34-44.
- [36] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. Impact of blockchain-enabled analytics as a tool to revolutionize the banking industry. *Data Science in Finance and Economics*, 2[3], 275-293.
- [37] Sazu, M. H., & Jahan, S. A. [2022]. The impact of big data analytics on supply chain management practices in fast moving consumer goods industry: evidence from developing countries. *International Journal of Business Reflections*, 3[1], 112-128.
- [38] Sazu, M. H., & Akter Jahan, S. (2022). Impact of big data analytics on government organizations. *Management & Datascience*, 6(2)
- [39] Jahan, S. A. (2024). How project management principles can lead to successful project completion in construction industry. *IPHO-Journal of Advance Research in Science And Engineering*, 2(11).
- [40] Jahan, S. A. (2024). Integrating Project Management Techniques and Stakeholder Engagement for Comprehensive Project Success: A Multi-Domain Analysis. *IPHO-Journal of Advance Research in Science And Engineering*, 2(11).
- [41] Jahan, S. A. (2024). A Unified Approach to Project Management: Integrating Information Views and ICT Tools. *IPHO-Journal of Advance Research in Science And Engineering*, 2(11).
- [42] Jahan, S. A. (2024). Utilizing Predictive Analytics and Machine Learning for Enhanced Project Risk Management and Resource Optimization. *IPHO-Journal of Advance Research in Science And Engineering*, 2(11).