Future of Work and Digital Management Journal

Article type:
Original Research

Article history:
Received 07 May 2024
Revised 18 June 2024
Accepted 24 June 2024
Published online 01 July 2024

Alireza. Mohammadzadeh[1], Seyedeh Fatemeh Johari[1*], Atefeh. Yousefi[2]

1 Department of Counseling, Urmia Branch, Islamic Azad University, Urmia, Iran
2 Department of Educational Sciences, Rasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rasht, Iran

Corresponding author email address:
s.fatemeh.johari96@gmail.com

How to cite this article:
Mohammadzadeh, A., Johari, S. F. & Yousefi, A. (2024). Identifying Key Enablers of Agile Knowledge Work in Digitally Distributed Teams. *Future of Work and Digital Management Journal, 2*(3), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.61838/fwdmj.2.3.1

Identifying Key Enablers of Agile Knowledge Work in Digitally Distributed Teams

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the key enablers that support agile knowledge work within digitally distributed teams operating in Tehran's technology sector. A qualitative research design was employed using semi-structured interviews with 29 professionals engaged in agile roles across various organizations in Tehran. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure a diverse representation of roles including software developers, product managers, agile coaches, and UX designers. Data collection continued until theoretical saturation was achieved. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using thematic analysis, facilitated by NVivo software. The analysis followed an inductive coding approach, enabling the emergence of themes grounded in participants' experiences. Credibility was enhanced through peer debriefing, memo writing, and audit trails. Three main categories emerged from the data: Digital Collaboration Infrastructure, Human-Centered Agile Practices, and Organizational Support and Culture. Thematic analysis revealed that enablers such as seamless tool integration, real-time communication platforms, and platform flexibility were essential for facilitating agile processes in distributed contexts. Human-centered practices—including psychological safety, adaptive planning, and peer learning—were found to support autonomy and responsiveness. Organizational-level enablers such as leadership engagement, agile-compatible policies, and contextual onboarding played a critical role in aligning agile values with distributed team operations. These findings align with and extend prior research, emphasizing the integrated influence of technological, interpersonal, and institutional factors on agile knowledge work. Agile knowledge work in digitally distributed teams is enabled through the convergence of robust digital infrastructure, psychologically safe team dynamics, and agile-aligned organizational support. These findings provide both theoretical insights and practical recommendations for organizations seeking to optimize distributed agile practices in dynamic work environments.

Keywords: Agile knowledge work, digitally distributed teams, enablers.

Introduction

The emergence of digital distribution in agile contexts stems from broader trends in globalization, hybrid work models, and rapid digitalization. Organizations increasingly rely on dispersed, cross-functional teams to execute complex projects, often under rapidly changing conditions. While agile methods are designed to accommodate change and foster collaboration, their effectiveness in distributed settings is not guaranteed and is highly contingent on enabling structures, tools, and cultures [1, 2]. Distributed agile teams often face challenges related to coordination, visibility, communication breakdowns, and conflicting time zones, which can hinder their ability to function as cohesive, self-organizing units [3, 4]. These contextual frictions necessitate a nuanced understanding of the infrastructure, practices, and organizational support systems that can enable or impede agile knowledge work.

Existing scholarship has begun to unpack the mechanisms that shape productivity in distributed agile environments. For instance, structural clarity, technological alignment, and agile coaching have been identified as significant contributors to

team effectiveness [5-7]. Particularly, the role of agile coaches and distributed leadership in fostering a culture of continuous improvement and empowerment has gained attention in recent years. Agile leadership in distributed settings is seen as dynamic, requiring responsiveness to both human and technical systems [6, 8]. Furthermore, distributed teams benefit from systems that promote real-time visibility and shared understanding across roles and geographies [9, 10]. These findings underline the importance of deliberate organizational strategies that address the specific needs of distributed agile teams.

The literature also suggests that agile frameworks, while inherently flexible, must be adapted to suit the realities of remote and hybrid work arrangements. The central role of feedback loops, iterative planning, and continuous learning in agile practices calls for technological infrastructure that can replicate the affordances of face-to-face collaboration [11, 12]. However, access to such infrastructure alone is insufficient. The cultural dimension—comprising psychological safety, team autonomy, and a learning-oriented mindset—has also been highlighted as a critical enabler of effective agile work [8, 13]. Studies show that distributed agile teams perform better when supported by practices that foster ownership, shared purpose, and adaptive problem-solving [14, 15]. These findings point to the interplay of technological, human, and organizational factors in determining team performance.

One critical area of concern is the coordination of roles and responsibilities within distributed agile teams. The lack of physical proximity increases the risk of ambiguity and duplication of effort, making clarity around task interdependence essential [9]. In this regard, role clarity and shared mental models are increasingly recognized as enablers of agility in distributed settings. Likewise, the integration of boundary objects—such as shared tools, documentation platforms, and visual project boards—helps align understanding across diverse team members and stakeholders [3, 4]. These tools not only facilitate task coordination but also act as mediators of trust, transparency, and accountability across geographic divides.

Furthermore, distributed agile teams often operate in environments characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA). Under these conditions, continuous feedback and retrospection become even more critical. Agile retrospectives, in particular, have been found to enhance collaboration and team cohesion when implemented thoughtfully in distributed settings [14, 16]. These practices create opportunities for teams to reflect on their processes, identify friction points, and co-develop improvements, thereby reinforcing adaptive capacity. Moreover, empowerment-oriented leadership, which promotes autonomy while maintaining alignment, has emerged as a key enabler of psychological safety and performance in agile teams [6, 8].

However, despite the growing body of literature, gaps remain in understanding the comprehensive set of enablers that support agile knowledge work in fully or partially distributed teams, especially in non-Western contexts. Much of the existing research has focused on large-scale software development firms in North America and Europe, with limited attention to the lived experiences of agile practitioners in other regions [17, 18]. This geographical bias constrains the generalizability of current findings and underrepresents the unique cultural and infrastructural conditions that shape agile work elsewhere. Moreover, while technical tools have been extensively studied, there is a need for more holistic investigations that integrate perspectives on leadership, team dynamics, organizational culture, and digital infrastructure.

In light of these gaps, this study aims to contribute to the literature by identifying key enablers of agile knowledge work in digitally distributed teams operating in Tehran.

Methods and Materials

Study Design and Participants

This qualitative research was conducted using a semi-structured interview approach to explore and identify key enablers of agile knowledge work in digitally distributed teams. The study employed an exploratory-descriptive design to gain in-depth insights into participants' experiences, practices, and perceptions within digitally mediated work environments. A total of 29 participants were purposefully selected based on their active involvement in agile knowledge work within digitally distributed teams located in Tehran. The sampling strategy emphasized diversity in organizational role, industry, and experience with agile methods, ensuring a rich variety of perspectives. Recruitment continued until theoretical saturation was reached, whereby no new conceptual themes emerged from additional data.

Data Collection

Data collection relied solely on semi-structured interviews, each lasting approximately 45 to 70 minutes. An interview guide was developed based on preliminary literature review and expert consultation, focusing on themes such as team collaboration, autonomy, digital tool usage, communication dynamics, and organizational support mechanisms. All interviews were conducted in Persian, either in person or via secure digital conferencing platforms, and were audio-recorded with informed consent. Interview transcripts were then transcribed verbatim and anonymized to protect participant confidentiality.

Data analysis

Data analysis followed a thematic analysis approach, facilitated by NVivo software to support systematic coding and categorization. An inductive coding strategy was used, allowing themes to emerge from the data rather than imposing pre-defined categories. The analytical process involved multiple readings of the transcripts, initial open coding, grouping of similar codes into categories, and abstraction into higher-order themes that reflect the enablers of agile knowledge work. The research team engaged in peer debriefing sessions to ensure the credibility and consistency of code interpretation, while ongoing memo-writing aided in capturing analytical insights throughout the process. The trustworthiness of the study was strengthened through strategies such as triangulation across participants, audit trails of coding decisions, and reflexive journaling by the researchers.

Findings and Results

A total of 29 participants took part in the study, all of whom were engaged in agile knowledge work within digitally distributed teams based in Tehran. The sample included 16 males and 13 females, with ages ranging from 27 to 52 years (mean age = 37.6 years). Participants represented a range of professional roles including software developers (n = 9), project managers (n = 6), UX/UI designers (n = 4), agile coaches (n = 3), product owners (n = 3), and quality assurance specialists (n = 4). Most participants (n = 22) reported having more than five years of experience in agile environments, while seven had between two and five years of experience. In terms of organizational sector, 18 participants worked in private tech companies, 6 in multinational corporations, and 5 in public sector IT departments. All participants were actively involved in digitally distributed teams, with 21 reporting daily collaboration with remote colleagues across different time zones.

Table 1

Themes, Subthemes, and Concepts of Agile Knowledge Work in Digitally Distributed Teams

Category (Main Theme)	Subcategory (Subtheme)	Concepts (Open Codes)
1. Digital Collaboration Infrastructure	1.1 Seamless Tool Integration	Cross-platform compatibility, Workflow automation, Unified communication stack, Cloud-based access
	1.2 Accessibility and Reliability	Low-latency connection, Minimal downtime, Tool stability, 24/7 access
	1.3 Platform Flexibility	Customizable interfaces, Third-party plugin support, Role-based features, Scalability
	1.4 Real-Time Communication Tools	Instant messaging, Video conferencing, Live annotation, Virtual whiteboards
	1.5 Knowledge Repositories	Shared drives, Version control, Tagging systems, Central documentation
	1.6 Data Security and Privacy	End-to-end encryption, Access control, Compliance protocols
	1.7 Mobile Compatibility	Responsive design, Mobile app availability, Notifications on mobile
2. Human-Centered Agile Practices	2.1 Psychological Safety	Open feedback culture, No-blame policy, Leader inclusivity
	2.2 Autonomy and Decision-Making	Decentralized task allocation, Empowered roles, Self-managed priorities
	2.3 Adaptive Planning	Iterative sprints, Mid-cycle adjustments, Flexible backlog management
	2.4 Peer Learning and Mentorship	Skill-sharing sessions, Buddy systems, Peer coaching, Pair programming
	2.5 Continuous Reflection and Feedback	Retrospective meetings, Feedback loops, Sprint reviews
	2.6 Recognition and Motivation	Peer acknowledgment, Reward systems, Task ownership pride
3. Organizational Support and Culture	3.1 Leadership Engagement	Active managerial presence, Strategic vision sharing, Conflict mediation
	3.2 Agile-Compatible Policies	Remote work policies, Agile-aligned KPIs, Role clarity
	3.3 Team Composition and Diversity	Cross-functional roles, Cultural awareness, Role rotation, Skill complementarity
	3.4 Training and Onboarding	Agile bootcamps, Tool training, Shadowing practices, Contextual learning
	3.5 Performance Evaluation Alignment	Outcome-based metrics, Iteration-level review, 360-degree feedback

The analysis of interview data with 29 participants led to the identification of three overarching themes: *Digital Collaboration Infrastructure*, *Human-Centered Agile Practices*, and *Organizational Support and Culture*. Each theme comprises a number of subcategories, highlighting the key enablers that facilitate agile knowledge work in digitally distributed teams. The following paragraphs present each subcategory in detail, supported by direct quotes from participants.

Seamless tool integration was frequently emphasized as a foundation for agile collaboration. Participants highlighted the importance of using interconnected digital tools that allow fluid transitions between tasks and platforms. One participant explained, “When Slack updates Jira or Trello cards automatically, it feels like everything is connected, and I don’t waste time switching back and forth.” This integration enables workflow automation, real-time updates, and consistent task tracking.

In relation to accessibility and reliability, participants stressed the need for tools that function consistently across time zones and conditions. Uninterrupted access was viewed as critical, especially during sprint planning or crisis resolution. As one interviewee stated, “If the server is down even for an hour, we lose momentum—it’s like the team just freezes.” Stable platforms and reliable cloud access were thus regarded as essential to sustaining agile velocity.

Platform flexibility was cited as another enabler, allowing team members to adapt digital environments to their specific roles and preferences. Some tools were praised for offering customizable dashboards and modular plugin support. A software developer remarked, “We each configure the interface based on what we need—mine looks totally different from the UX lead’s, and that’s the beauty of it.”

Participants described real-time communication tools such as messaging apps and video conferencing as vital for simulating the immediacy of co-located teams. One product manager shared, “Our daily stand-ups happen over video, and we use digital whiteboards to brainstorm live—it’s not the same as a room, but it gets close.” These tools supported instant feedback and dynamic problem-solving.

Knowledge repositories were highlighted as critical for maintaining team continuity, especially in asynchronous environments. Shared drives and well-maintained documentation were considered "the memory of the team," as one participant put it. "If someone new joins or someone's off for a week, everything is documented—they don't have to ask around for context," another added.

Concerns around data security and privacy also emerged. Participants valued platforms that ensure secure access and comply with organizational policies. "We handle sensitive client data, so encryption and access control are not optional—they're part of our agile checklist," a team leader emphasized.

Mobile compatibility was a practical concern, especially for teams working across time zones. Participants appreciated being able to check notifications or respond to issues using mobile apps. One team member stated, "I sometimes approve tasks or reply to blockers from my phone when I'm out—it helps things move faster."

Under the second main theme, *Human-Centered Agile Practices*, the subcategory of psychological safety was repeatedly mentioned. Participants described environments where team members felt safe to voice concerns or admit errors. "Our lead always says, 'If you mess up, talk about it early.' That makes it easier to be honest," a backend developer noted.

Autonomy and decision-making were also vital, with team members appreciating decentralized control over their work. "I choose how I tackle my tasks—there's trust that I'll deliver," said one participant. This sense of ownership was seen as motivating and empowering.

Adaptive planning practices, such as iterative sprint cycles and mid-course corrections, were common. One interviewee explained, "We plan weekly, but nothing is fixed in stone—if we learn something new mid-sprint, we adjust." This flexibility was seen as a marker of agility in action.

Participants emphasized the value of peer learning and mentorship through informal knowledge-sharing practices. "Sometimes we just hop on a quick call to troubleshoot together. I've learned more from peers than formal training," one participant shared, underlining the cultural importance of collaborative growth.

Continuous reflection and feedback was a distinct subtheme, particularly visible in practices like retrospectives and sprint reviews. "Our team actually looks forward to retros—we celebrate wins and dissect what went wrong without blame," a participant remarked, reinforcing a learning-focused mindset.

Another enabler was recognition and motivation, with participants noting that positive reinforcement encouraged engagement. As one interviewee put it, "A quick shout-out in the group chat when someone solves a tough bug—it boosts morale more than people think."

The third main category, *Organizational Support and Culture*, included leadership engagement, which was described as both symbolic and functional. "When our manager joins sprint planning, we feel our work matters. It's not just a checklist to them," said a designer, highlighting how engaged leadership shapes team motivation.

Agile-compatible policies were described as enablers that align formal structures with agile values. "When HR measures performance based on collaborative outcomes, not just individual tasks, it really supports our way of working," one team lead commented.

The diversity of roles and perspectives was highlighted under team composition and diversity. Participants believed that cross-functional teams fostered innovation and resilience. "When our tester, designer, and developer brainstorm together, we get creative solutions you wouldn't get from just one view," noted a participant.

Training and onboarding programs were also considered critical, particularly in aligning new team members with agile tools and norms. One junior developer explained, “My onboarding was mostly shadowing and learning by doing. It helped me get up to speed with how we sprint, not just the tools.”

Finally, performance evaluation alignment was noted as a structural support that ensures consistency between agile practices and organizational assessments. “We’re evaluated on how we contribute to the team goal, not just how fast we finish tasks—that reinforces collaboration,” a participant explained.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study explored the key enablers of agile knowledge work in digitally distributed teams through a qualitative investigation of 29 professionals based in Tehran. Using semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis, three main categories emerged: *Digital Collaboration Infrastructure*, *Human-Centered Agile Practices*, and *Organizational Support and Culture*. These categories reflect the interrelated structural, interpersonal, and cultural dimensions that enable effective knowledge work in agile, digitally mediated environments.

The first category, *Digital Collaboration Infrastructure*, underscores the foundational role of technology in facilitating agile processes among geographically dispersed teams. Participants emphasized the necessity of seamless tool integration, reliable platforms, flexible systems, and mobile compatibility to ensure efficiency and accessibility across distributed contexts. This finding aligns closely with the work of Ågren (2022), who argued that technical enablers must extend beyond software to include infrastructure that supports real-time feedback and integration across systems [11]. Similarly, Lee et al. (2024) highlighted that perceived transparency in digital systems contributes significantly to project quality, especially when team members rely heavily on shared platforms and communication tools [10].

The identification of real-time communication tools and shared knowledge repositories as critical enablers supports the conclusion that distributed teams require not only access to information but also mechanisms for timely exchange and co-construction of knowledge. This resonates with the observations of Maharao (2023), who emphasized that the effectiveness of distributed agile teams depends on reliable communication infrastructures that reduce latency and foster real-time problem-solving [1]. Likewise, Cornide-Reyes et al. (2021) noted that the ability to utilize digital tools efficiently is considered a key skill in agile environments, further validating the current study's findings [17].

The second category, *Human-Centered Agile Practices*, reflects the interpersonal and cultural mechanisms that sustain agile work beyond technical structures. Participants emphasized psychological safety, autonomy, continuous reflection, peer learning, and recognition as integral components of their daily practice. These findings are consistent with research by Sauer and Nicklich (2021), who examined the paradoxes of self-organized work and found that empowerment must be accompanied by clear frameworks that support autonomy without leading to isolation or misalignment [8]. In this study, participants described how psychological safety fostered openness, experimentation, and honest feedback—all of which are essential for team learning and adaptation.

The role of peer learning and mentorship also emerged as a strong enabler, echoing the findings of Spiegler et al. (2021), who observed that leadership in agile teams increasingly takes the form of distributed knowledge facilitation, where senior members guide others through informal coaching [6]. Stray et al. (2021) further supported this view by emphasizing the evolving role of the agile coach as a performance enhancer who encourages collaboration, feedback, and adaptive thinking

[5]. Participants in the present study expressed appreciation for learning opportunities embedded in their team culture, such as impromptu troubleshooting sessions and retrospective reflections—practices that mirror agile principles of continuous improvement.

Moreover, the subcategory of adaptive planning reflects the flexibility needed to respond to rapidly changing project requirements in distributed teams. The findings here align with Sathe and Panse (2022), who demonstrated that agile mindsets—characterized by flexibility, learning orientation, and collaborative adaptation—significantly improve team productivity during periods of uncertainty, such as the COVID-19 pandemic [13]. The current study reinforces this view, showing how adaptive sprint planning and mid-cycle adjustments enable distributed teams to remain aligned and responsive, despite physical separation.

The third major category, *Organizational Support and Culture*, points to the systemic factors that enable or constrain agility. Participants emphasized leadership engagement, agile-compatible policies, onboarding practices, and role clarity as crucial supports. These insights echo the research of Kasauli et al. (2020), who found that coordination in large-scale agile organizations often depends on the use of boundary objects and organizational scaffolds to navigate the complexity of inter-team collaboration [3]. Similarly, McCarthy et al. (2020) emphasized that shared artifacts—such as documentation platforms, workflow tools, and visual dashboards—act as bridges between distributed teams, enabling alignment without constant verbal communication [4].

Leadership engagement emerged as particularly significant. Participants in this study described how active managerial presence during agile events reinforced team motivation and cohesion. This finding supports the empirical observations of Sathe and Panse (2024), who modeled enablers of productivity in enterprise-level agile development and found that visible, consistent leadership was a top factor in promoting engagement and alignment [19]. In a similar vein, Nascimento et al. (2022) identified leadership buy-in and empowerment as key enablers of agile success, particularly in environments marked by uncertainty and complexity [12].

Agile-compatible performance evaluations were also found to be essential for sustaining motivation and reinforcing collaboration. This reflects the argument made by Kumar (2021a), who identified mismatches between agile team practices and traditional performance measurement systems as a persistent challenge in agile adoption [20]. When performance metrics support agile values—such as teamwork, learning, and adaptability—rather than just individual outputs, teams are more likely to internalize and sustain agile behaviors.

The importance of training and onboarding practices, particularly for integrating new members into distributed agile teams, was another key finding. Participants noted that contextual learning and shadowing were more effective than traditional training modules. This observation aligns with Lautert et al. (2019), who found that onboarding in global agile teams often requires tailored approaches that account for technological tools, communication norms, and agile values simultaneously [18]. Similarly, Junita (2021) argued that human resource strategies in agile organizations must evolve to support learning-centric onboarding processes that prepare employees for dynamic, cross-functional roles [15].

Finally, the emphasis on diverse and cross-functional teams as enablers of creativity and problem-solving echoes the findings of Berntzen et al. (2019), who showed that relational coordination among product owners and team members is enhanced when roles are complementary and knowledge is shared openly [21]. In the current study, participants highlighted

how exposure to multiple viewpoints facilitated innovation and accelerated decision-making, reinforcing the agile ideal of collective intelligence.

In summary, the findings of this study reinforce the understanding that agility in digitally distributed teams is not determined by any single factor but rather by the dynamic interplay of digital infrastructure, interpersonal practices, and organizational culture. These results corroborate and extend existing research, particularly in underrepresented contexts such as the Middle East, where agile practices are being locally adapted to suit emerging digital ecosystems. The study thus contributes not only to the academic discourse on distributed agility but also offers practical insights for leaders and teams navigating the challenges of digital collaboration.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. First, the sample was geographically limited to professionals based in Tehran, which may restrict the generalizability of findings to other regions or cultural settings. While Tehran offers a rich technological ecosystem, factors such as national digital infrastructure, work norms, and organizational hierarchies may differ significantly from other contexts. Second, the study relied exclusively on self-reported data through interviews, which may introduce social desirability bias or selective memory. Observational or longitudinal data could have complemented participant accounts. Third, the study focused solely on enablers of agile knowledge work, without examining inhibitors or tensions in depth, which could provide a more balanced view of the challenges in distributed agile practice.

Future research can expand on the current findings by conducting comparative studies across multiple geographical regions or industries to explore how enablers of agile knowledge work differ across cultural and organizational settings. Quantitative or mixed-methods designs could be used to test the relative importance of specific enablers identified in this study. Additionally, longitudinal research may help capture how enablers evolve over time as teams mature or undergo organizational transformation. Further investigation into the role of specific technologies—such as AI-based collaboration tools, automated feedback systems, or virtual onboarding environments—could also yield valuable insights into the evolving nature of agile work in the digital age.

Organizations aiming to enhance agile knowledge work in distributed teams should invest in integrated digital platforms that support real-time communication, shared documentation, and cross-device accessibility. Agile leaders should prioritize building psychologically safe environments that encourage feedback, experimentation, and peer learning. Performance metrics and HR policies must be aligned with agile values, emphasizing team success, adaptability, and continuous improvement. Finally, onboarding programs should be redesigned to include mentorship, contextual learning, and role-based shadowing to facilitate quicker integration into agile workflows.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who cooperated in carrying out this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

The study protocol adhered to the principles outlined in the Helsinki Declaration, which provides guidelines for ethical research involving human participants. Written consent was obtained from all participants in the study.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

[1] C. S. Maharao, "A Study on Managing Distributed and Remote Teams in It Agile Projects," *Shodhkosh Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2023, doi: 10.29121/shodhkosh.v4.i2.2023.2285.

[2] A. Saxena, S. Venkatagiri, and R. K. Bandi, "Managing Contradictory Tensions in Agile Distributed Development," pp. 101-104, 2021, doi: 10.4018/978-1-7998-4165-4.ch005.

[3] R. Kasauli, R. Wohlrab, E. Knauss, J.-P. Steghöfer, J. Horkoff, and S. Maro, "Charting Coordination Needs in Large-Scale Agile Organisations With Boundary Objects and Methodological Islands," pp. 51-60, 2020, doi: 10.1145/3379177.3388897.

[4] S. McCarthy, P. O'Raghallaigh, C. Fitzgerald, and F. Adam, "Building Bridges, Burning Bridges: The Use of Boundary Objects in Agile Distributed ISD Teams," 2020, doi: 10.24251/hicss.2020.063.

[5] V. Stray, A. Tkalich, and N. B. Moe, "The Agile Coach Role: Coaching for Agile Performance Impact," 2021, doi: 10.24251/hicss.2021.817.

[6] S. V. Spiegler, C. Heinecke, and S. Wagner, "An Empirical Study on Changing Leadership in Agile Teams," *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10664-021-09949-5.

[7] O. Psarov and E. Druzhinin, "Enhancing Agile Team Productivity With Metrics," *Scientific Journal of the Ternopil National Technical University*, vol. 1, no. 113, pp. 93-99, 2024, doi: 10.33108/visnyk_tntu2024.01.093.

[8] S. Sauer and M. Nicklich, "Empowerment and Beyond: Paradoxes of Self-Organised Work," *Work Organisation Labour & Globalisation*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2021, doi: 10.13169/workorgalaboglob.15.2.0073.

[9] S. I. Wong and S. v. Gils, "Initiated and Received Task Interdependence and Distributed Team Performance: The Mediating Roles of Different Forms of Role Clarity," *Ai & Society*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 781-790, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s00146-021-01241-w.

[10] P. T. Y. Lee, A. Lee, M. Chau, and B. Deng, "How Perceived Transparency in Information System Development Processes Improves Project Quality in Agile IT Enterprises," *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, vol. 124, no. 6, pp. 2284-2311, 2024, doi: 10.1108/imds-07-2023-0493.

[11] S. M. Ågren, "Agile Beyond Teams and Feedback Beyond Software in Automotive Systems," 2022, doi: 10.48550/arxiv.2203.13130.

[12] N. Nascimento, A. R. Santos, A. Sales, and R. Chanin, "Enablers and Inhibitors in Agile Teams," 2022, doi: 10.1145/3524614.3528623.

[13] C. A. Sathe and C. Panse, "Analyzing the Impact of Agile Mindset Adoption on Software Development Teams Productivity During COVID-19," *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 96-115, 2022, doi: 10.1108/jamr-05-2022-0088.

[14] K. Duehr *et al.*, "The Positive Impact of Agile Retrospectives on the Collaboration of Distributed Development Teams – A Practical Approach on the Example of Bosch Engineering GMBH," *Proceedings of the Design Society*, vol. 1, pp. 3071-3080, 2021, doi: 10.1017/pds.2021.568.

[15] A. Junita, "Agile HR Strategies: Prerequisite of Business Competitiveness in a Dynamic Environment," 2021, doi: 10.4108/eai.9-10-2020.2304778.

[16] N. Santos, J. Pereira, N. Ferreira, and R. J. Machado, "Using Logical Architecture Models for Inter-Team Management of Distributed Agile Teams," *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1-17, 2021, doi: 10.4018/ijitsa.289996.

[17] H. Cornide-Reyes *et al.*, "Key Skills to Work With Agile Frameworks in Software Engineering: Chilean Perspectives," *Ieee Access*, vol. 9, pp. 84724-84738, 2021, doi: 10.1109/access.2021.3087717.

[18] T. Lautert, N. Adolfo Gustavo Serra Seca, and N. P. Kozievitch, "A Survey on Agile Practices and Challenges of a Global Software Development Team," pp. 128-143, 2019, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-36701-5_11.

[19] C. A. Sathe and C. Panse, "Modelling the Enablers of Productivity of Enterprise-Level Agile Software Development Process Using Modified TISM Approach," *Journal of Modelling in Management*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 1749-1772, 2024, doi: 10.1108/jm2-12-2023-0285.

[20] T. Kumar, "Research Findings in the Domain of Agile Methodologies," pp. 214-243, 2021, doi: 10.4018/978-1-7998-7367-9.ch005.

[21] M. Berntzen, N. B. Moe, and V. Stray, "The Product Owner in Large-Scale Agile: An Empirical Study Through the Lens of Relational Coordination Theory," pp. 121-136, 2019, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-19034-7_8.