

Large-Scale Agile Implementation in Large Financial Institutions: A Systematic Literature Review

Chris H. Hoeseb

Department of Information Systems
University of Cape Town
Cape Town, South Africa
hsbchr001@myuct.ac.za

Maureen Tanner

Department of Information Systems
University of Cape Town
Cape Town, South Africa
mc.tanner@uct.ac.za

Abstract— Organizations must constantly evolve and adapt to meet customer demands in an ever-changing business environment. The most notable differences have been in the way fintech companies use agile practices to speed up software development and their time to market for new products. This has impacted the way how large financial institutions operate. Large Scale Agile Development (LSAD) is popular, and many studies are being conducted in that domain. However, there is a need to understand the research landscape and the level of theorization on all the studies that were conducted, so that future research opportunities and needs can be identified in this domain. This study aims to synthesize and analyze the research trends and provide a synopsis on the levels of theorization in LSAD research while at the same time also recommending areas for future research in the field of LSAD in the financial sector. Using a systematic literature review protocol, we identified 39 primary studies that focused on LSAD in the financial services sector between 2015 and 2020. The studies were limited to English language only and were sourced from the Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore and ScienceDirect electronic databases. Of all papers reviewed, 14 produced Analysis theories, 9 produced Explanation theories, 3 produced Explanation & Prediction theories, and 7 produced Design & Action theories. Interestingly, none produced Prediction theories. 6 of the papers were systematic literature reviews. The findings indicate that LSAD research in the financial sector has not yet matured in the explanation & prediction theories, especially in the prediction-type theories. This provides an avenue for future research to provide the building blocks for theory development. The focus of future studies should be on building a predictive theory around LSAD Teams in the financial Sector.

Keywords— *Agile Software Development, Scaled-Agile Transformation, LSAD Theories, Large-Scale Agile Frameworks, LSAD Software development issues*

I. INTRODUCTION

Agile Software Development (ASD) requires small, collocated teams to develop innovative products for customers at a fast pace. However, challenges emerge when this team requires input from actors outside of the ASD team to deliver a product. This is where the concept of Large-Scale Agile Software Development (LSAD) comes into play. LSAD occurs when companies attempt to scale ASD methods to other

business units or other teams who are not part of the ASD team or who are not collocated with the ASD team (Moe & Mikalsen, 2020). There are several scaling methods (Frameworks) like the Scaled Agile Framework (SAFe), Scrum of Scrums (SoS), Disciplined Agile Delivery (DAD), Large Scale Scrum (LeSS), Spotify, Nexus, and Recipes for Agile Governance in the Enterprise (RAGE). These frameworks were all developed with the sole purpose of an end-to-end delivery lifecycle of products involving multiple business units or team members outside of the ASD team (Alqudah & Razali, 2016). More and more organizations are transitioning towards LSAD. According to the 14th Annual State of Agile Report, 81% of the respondents mentioned that members of the same agile team are not in the same geographical location (co-located). Moreover, 71% of the respondents where collaborating with multiple teams across different geographical locations. This has created research interest in the domain of LSAD with organizations increasingly supporting and encouraging collaboration across geographic boundaries (VersionOne, 2020).

While there is an increasing trend towards the adoption and implementation of LSAD in organizations, multiple studies have highlighted some of the challenges that these organizations face. Some of the challenges relate to the handling of release planning, handling of task variety, handling the application architecture, managing technical, social and process debt plus requirements engineering challenges during LSAD (Salameh & Bass, 2019; Kilu, 2018; Bass, 2016; Dorp, 2019; Uludağ, Kleeaus, Xu, & Matthes, 2017; Martini, Stray, & Moe, 2019; Kasauli, 2020). The need to have a more holistic understanding of LSAD studies that have been conducted to date is evident. This is essential to support the quest to have a more strategic approach towards any future research in this area. In order to make a meaningful contribution to the body of knowledge, we need to understand what opportunities exist for future research, to avoid re-inventing the wheel by continuously conducting similar studies.

Large financial institutions have been using waterfall-based methods historically to develop and deliver software products. Although a lot of value was delivered to customers using this methods in the past, waterfall-based approaches are unable to keep up with the current business environment which demands for an accelerated software delivery process and the ability to

manage ever changing customer priorities in the new digital age. Large financial institutions have to compete with financial technology (fintech) companies who are purely only making use of ASD methods while large financial institutions have to take time to transition from a waterfall based to an agile based approach in order to stay competitive in the market. There is a need for more studies to be conducted on LSAD in the large financial institution sector as this institutions have to develop at the same speed or faster than that of fintech companies while they are having a much larger product base and are heavily dependent on legacy systems (Kilu, 2018).

Some systematic literature reviews on LSAD have been conducted to date. More recent studies include a systematic mapping study on LSAD by Uludaga, Philipp, Abheeshta, Paasivaara, Lassenius, and Matthes (2020). Uludaga, et al. (2020) provide a systematic mapping review of LSAD focusing on providing an overview of the state-of-the-art research and identify areas for future research. Their study categorized existing literature through a visual map summary that identified directions for future research (Uludaga, et al., 2020). Based on the findings from 133 selected LSAD studies in the period 2007 to 2019. Uludaga, et al. (2020) concluded that LSAD research is receiving increasing attention from researchers with 47% of all selected studies having been published in the last two years, indicating that the topic of LSAD is becoming more important than ever. Additionally, another study by Conboy and Carrol (2019) outlined the large-scale transformation challenges and recommendations, using 13 agile transformation cases implemented over a period of 15 years. Conboy and Carrol (2019) identified nine challenges associated with implementing SAFe, Scrum-at-Scale, Spotify, LeSS, Nexus, and other mixed or customized large-scale agile frameworks. A key challenge identified was the lack of evidence-based use of Large-Scale Agile Frameworks.

While such systematic literature reviews have been conducted to date, there still exists a gap in literature on the research trends, particularly pertaining to the level of theorization of the past studies. Theory is defined “as abstract entities that aim to describe, explain, and enhance understanding of the world and, in some cases, to provide predictions of what will happen in the future and to give a basis for intervention and action” (Gregor, 2006, p.6). Gregor (2006) conducted a study on how theory can be casualized, explained, predicted, and generalized in the field of Information Systems (IS). She introduced five concepts of theorization which are the theory of analyzing, explaining, predicting, explaining, and predicting, and for design and action (Gregor, 2006).

The theory of analysis says what is (it does not expand beyond analysis and description); the theory of explanation says what is, how, why, when, and where (provides an explanation but does not predict with any precision); the theory of prediction says what is and what will be (provides predictions and testable propositions but does not have well justified explanations); the theory of explanation and prediction says what is, how, why, when, where and what will be (provides predictions together with testable propositions and explanations) and the theory of design and action says how to do something (gives explicit prescriptions to construct an artifact) (Gregor, 2006). It is important to theorize in the field of IS as its set’s the academics

apart from consultants and practitioners and provides knowledge accumulation in a systematic manner that can enlighten professional practice. None of the systematic literature reviews of LSAD to date have sought to explore the level of theorization from such studies. Moreover, a focused literature review of studies conducted in the large financial institutions has not yet been conducted. This study addresses this gap.

A. Objectives of the Study

The objective of this paper is to synthesize and analyze the research trends and provide a synopsis on the levels of theorization in LSAD research. The specific research questions are:

- RQ1: What are the research trends around Large Scale Agile Development in large financial institutions?
- RQ2: What are the levels of theorization in Large Scale Agile Development research in large financial institutions?
- RQ3: What are the current research opportunities and needs around Large-Scale Agile Development in large financial institutions?

In answering the research questions, the study highlights the status of current literature and proposes avenues for future research in relation to LSAD implementations and theorization of literature. The study reflects on what has been done to date and provides recommendations for future research especially around the aspect the different types of theorization. This will be useful for other researchers, in that, it helps them to understand where they must now focus their work.

The rest of the article is structured as follows: Section II describes the systematic literature review protocol followed. Section III presents the findings, analysis, and interpretation of the research trends in LSAD. Section IV will then elaborate on the summary of the findings by reviewing the level of theorization in LSAD research and draw useful conclusions on the needs and current research opportunities in LSAD and the level of theorization.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The study follows the guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering research, as prescribed by Keele (2007). The review process followed a literature protocol with the following phases:

- Planning the review: associated with planning, including the identification of the need for a review protocol, and evaluating the review protocol.
- Conducting the review: started with the identification of research and ended with data synthesis.
- Reporting the review: this final stage, which involves reporting of the review involved the specification of dissemination mechanisms and formatting the main report.

A. Planning the Review (Data Sources and Search strategy)

Literature from 2015 to 2020 was identified and reviewed, as previous related reviews like Uludaga, et al. (2020) had observed an increasing interest in the topic in the last five years. Keele (2007) cautioned against limiting results too soon, specifically for information technology related systematic literature reviews, as well as avoiding publication bias (Henriques & Tanner, 2017). To address this concern, the search strategy included, conference and workshop proceedings, as well as unpublished thesis and/or dissertations in the search strategy, thus, reducing the risk of overlooking pertinent literature. The search was limited to English language papers, in three electronic databases, which included “Google Scholar (scholar.google.com)”, “IEEE Xplore (ieeexplore.ieee.org)” and “ScienceDirect (sciencedirect.com)”.

B. Conducting the Review (Search Synonyms)

The search terms were further tweaked using the Microsoft Academic (academic.microsoft.com) database website, which provided suggestions based on studies in the field of LSAD. A reading list and search agent was created on Microsoft Academic, which was also used to validate the search strings used in Google Scholar and check if any pertinent literature had been omitted. As a result, the search terms were then adjusted and limited to the search words specified as follows:

Google Scholar (352 Results)

- “agile + agility + scaled agile + Agile Software Development + Agile and financial services industry or banking + Large Scale Agile Framework”

ScienceDirect (585 results)

- “agile + agility + scaled agile + Agile Software Development + Agile Large-Scale Agile Framework AND financial services industry OR banking”

IEEE Explorer (235 Relevant Results)

- “Agile” OR “Scaled Agile”

For Google Scholar, the search was then expanded by restricting the Years to 2015 and then expanding the search results by clicking on related articles and cited by buttons. The search results were saved in the Google Scholar Profile Library. After saving the articles, they were then tagged and exported to Bibliography Management software’s covered in the next subsection.

C. Conducting the Review (Bibliography Management and Document Retrieval)

The “Bibliographic packages”, Citavi 6.3 (Swiss Academic Software GmbH), EndNote X9 (Clarivate Analytics) and Qiqqa (Quantis Ltd) were used to perform an exhaustive search for full texts and references. All search results were directly imported into Citavi version 6.3 reference manager through the Citavi Reference Picker extension on Google Chrome. A similar approach was followed for ScienceDirect and IEEE Xplore

databases. For IEEE Xplore, the search was expanded to conferences and proceedings.

D. Conducting the Review (Study selection)

The same bibliographic packages were also used to automate the exclusion criteria. This was done by creating smart groups in Citavi 6.3 and EndNote X9, which effected the exclusion criteria. Citavi 6.3 and EndNote X9 were effective for bulk downloads of multiple references, while Qiqqa was more effective for searching and updating the Bibliotic information of the single references. The initial search yielded 1172 references which were autonomously retrieved from ScienceDirect, Google Scholar and IEEE Xplore Databases.

The automation tasks ensured that references imported were grouped and screened by publication type, year, having BibTex and having full text, Citavi 6.3 retrieved 411 full text articles. The next screening process relied on Smart Groups in EndNote X9, which resulted in the exclusion of articles from journals in the fields of Cleaner Production, Manufacturing and Supply Chain. This saw the number of articles with full text and references reducing to 162 documents and covering the topic of LSAD. These primary articles were then exported to a Qiqqa library hosted on the following Qiqqa Web address: <http://www.qiqqa.com/Library/aHoukw3i9U6ebowwu144qg/Chris-Primary-Studies/Documents/#>

The study selection was done with the aid of Qiqqa’s machine learning tagging and auto-tagging features from the Qiqqa’s in-built Expedition and Brainstorm functions. Using Qiqqa’s Expedition, the 162 articles in the library were further grouped using the following search terms/tags:

- Agile software development
- Scaled agile Transformation
- Large scaled agile development (LSAD)
- Large scale agile framework
- Best practices agile practices
- Challenges or barriers
- Success factors.

The benefits of this thematic approach are that the review was not limited by the research question, as the Qiqqa library Expedition can provide contexts and insights of the themes in the primary articles. The citations, annotations, and the linkages of primary articles in Qiqqa made it possible to further refine the themes and tags resulting in 64 studies, which were then exported to NVIVO 12 for data extraction.

E. Conducting the Review (Data Extraction and Synthesis)

Each of the 64 papers were manually reviewed one by one to confirm if they focused on LSAD in the financial services sector. This resulted in a further refined list of 39 papers for this study the final list of 39 relevant papers were transferred to NVIVO 12 (QSR International) for the analysis and interpretation phase.

III. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION (REPORTING THE REVIEW)

The 39 primary articles were reviewed and catalogued by authors and year of publication, and categorized according to the themes, sub-themes, and the level of theorization (see Appendix 1 for the list of papers reviewed). The thematic cataloguing followed a three-phase approach. In the first phase the full text of each article was reviewed, specifically focusing on the study type, the quality of reporting, rigor, and credibility (Dyba° & Dingsøy, 2008). Most of the articles (16) were single case studies, followed by systematic literature reviews (6) and multiple case studies (6). The remainder of the studies were categorized into mixed approach (2), qualitative interviews (2), quantitative studies (3) and workshop reports (2). As can be seen in Table I. The measures used by Dyba° and Dingsøy (2008) are mostly suitable for empirical studies, thus the reason they could not be utilized for the literature review quality assessment.

TABLE I. STUDY TYPES BY QUALITY CRITERION

Study Type	N	Quality of Reporting*	Rigour*	Credibility*
Design Science Approach	1	3.00	1.00	0.00
Single Case Study	16	2.50	2.63	1.13
Mixed Approach	2	2.50	3.00	0.00
Qualitative Interviews	3	2.33	3.33	1.00
Quantitative Study	3	2.33	2.33	0.67
Multiple Case Study	6	1.67	2.33	0.50
Workshop Report	2	1.50	2.00	1.00
Systematic Literature Review	6	1.33	1.83	0.83

*The values are mean scores of the quality of reporting (3 items), rigor (4 items) and credibility (2 items). The scores per item were rated 1 - N/A, 2 - No, 3 -Yes).

In the second phase, the objectives and findings of the various papers were thematically coded, to identify research sub-themes in the field of LSAD. Thereafter, the codes were logically grouped into 5 major research trends and core findings as shown in Table II.

The third phase focused on the level of theorization based on the Gregor (2006) classifications and interrelations of Information System (IS) theories as shown in Table III. The findings are further discussed in line with the theorization levels. It must be noted that the papers classified as systematic literature reviews were not relevant for any level of theorization. The analysis theory says what is. Papers categorized underneath this theory did not extend beyond analysis and description and had no causal relationship with other trends. The explanation theory says what is, how, why, when, and where. The papers provided explanations without the aim of prediction. Prediction theory says what is and what will be, which none of the papers did. Explanation and prediction theory say what is, how, why, when, where, and what will be. The papers predicted, explained, and provided testable propositions. Design and action theory tell you how to do

something. This paper's gave explicit instructions either using techniques or methods in constructing a specific artifact.

TABLE II - RESEARCH THEMES AND SUB-THEMES

Research Theme	Sub-Theme & Source
LASD Frameworks	Comparing and Reviewing scaling agile frameworks - [S20] [S3] [S28]
	Comparing Waterfall and agile project management in LSAD - [S9]
	Agile methods Tailoring in LSAD - [S2] [S5] [S7][S14][S15][S16][S32]
LSAD Enterprise Architecture	Agile Enterprise architecture in LSAD - [S4] [S21] S36][S37]
LSAD Software development issues	Balancing technical, social and process debt in LSAD - [S30]
	Requirements Engineering for GSD using SAFe - [S16] [S20]
	Requirements engineering in LSAD - [S20]
	Software Process Improvement LSAD - [S5] [S12] [S21] [S37]
LSAD Teams	Autonomy in LSAD - [S12] [S15] [S23] [S25] [S26]
	Impact of education and training on LSAD - [S18]
	Inter-team coordination in LSAD - [S10] [S16] [S21]
	LSAD and impact on job performance and happiness - [S12] [S14]
	Roles and structure in LSAD autonomous teams - [S24] [S35] [S36] [S37]
LSAD Transformation	Agile Scaling to achieve product market fit - [S8] [S21]
	Agile Transformation in large organizations - [S6] [S7] [S13] [S17] [S19] [S22] [S27] [S28] [S29] [S31] [S38]
	Challenges of large-scale agile transformations - [S4] [S5] [S11] [S13] [S17] [S19] [S22] [S31] [S32] [S33] [S34][S39]
	Large-scale offshore agile software development - [S4]
	Overcoming challenges of LSAD - [S1] [S2]
	Risk Management in Scaled Agile Environments [S2]
	Success factors of LSAD - [S11] [S17] [S19] [S32] [S33]
	Using agile project management in large software projects - [S9]

TABLE III. RESEARCH TRENDS BY LEVEL OF THEORISATION

Level of Theorization	Research Theme & Source
Analysis (14)	LSAD Frameworks - [S9]
	LSAD Software Development Issues - [S20] [S30]
	LSAD Teams - [S15] [S23][S25][S26][S36]
	LSAD Transformation - [S1] [S8] [S22][S27][S34][S39]
Explanation (9)	LSAD Frameworks - [S14] [S32]
	LSA Teams - [S10] [S12]
	LSAD Transformation - [S6] [S17][S31]
	LSAD Enterprise Architecture - [S4][S5]
Explanation & Prediction (3)	LSAD Frameworks - [S16]
	LSAD Transformation - [S33]
	LSAD Enterprise Architecture - [S37]
Prediction (0)	None
Design & Action (7)	LSAD Frameworks - [S2][S16]
	LSAD Software Development Issues - [S21]
	LSAD Teams - [S18][S24]
	LSAD Transformation - [S7][S19]
Systematic Literature Reviews (6)	LSAD Frameworks - [S3][S28]
	LSAD Transformation - [S11][S13][S29][S38]

1) *Analysis theories*

According to Gregor (2006) the analysis theories analyze "what is" as opposed to explaining causality or attempting predictive generalizations. These theories are at the lowest level of the theorization spectrum. Analysis level of theorization implies that the relationships specified are classificatory, compositional, or associative but not explicitly causal. As can be seen in Table III, most of the papers reviewed (14) formulated theories at the analysis level. Specific research themes in that category related to LSAD frameworks (1), LSAD software development issues (2), LAD teams (5) and LSAD transformation (6). More specifically the theories at the Analysis level related to the following findings from literature:

- Comparison of large-scale agile frameworks [S9]
- Requirements engineering challenges during large-scale agile [S20]
- Practices to manage technical, social and process debt [S30]
- Autonomy within LSAD Teams [S15][S25][S26]
- Teams Collaboration Practices [S23]
- Cross-organizational multi-team structure model [S36]
- Organizational Agility Evaluation [S1]
- Agile Scaling Implementation strategies [S8]
- Challenges of large-scale agile implementations [S22]
- Benefits of large-scale agile implementations [S27]
- Drivers of Large-Scale Agile Transformation [S34][S39]

2) *Explanation theories*

Explanation theories are concerned with explaining a phenomenon without aiming to predict with any precision. For such theories, no testable propositions are formulated. Explanations of how, when, where, and why events occurred may be presented, giving rise to process-type theory. This class could well be labeled theory for understanding, as these theories often have an emphasis on showing others how the world may be viewed in a certain way, with the aim of bringing about an altered understanding of how things are or why they are as they are (Gregor, 2006). As can be seen in Table III, 9 of the papers reviewed formulated theories at Explanation level. Specific research themes in that category related to LSAD frameworks (2), LSAD LAD teams (2), LSAD transformation (3) and LSAD enterprise architecture (2). More specifically the theories at the Explanation level related to the following findings from literature:

- Coordinating planning meetings [S14] [S32]
- Cross-organizational multi-team structure model [S10]
- Autonomy within LSAD Teams [S12]
- Drivers of Large-Scale Agile Transformation [S6]
- Agile Scaling Implementation strategies [S17]

- Challenges of large-scale agile implementations [S4][S17][S31]
- Intervening conditions for large-scale agile transformation [S17]
- Process of radical organizational change around a transition to agile [S17]
- Success factors of large-scale agile transformation [S17]
- Risk-Management in Cross-Team Project [S5]

3) *Explanation & Prediction theories*

Explanation & Prediction theories provide both causal explanations for a phenomenon as well as testable propositions. Such theories specifically stipulate what is, how, why, when, where and what will be (Gregor, 2006). As can be seen in Table III, 3 of the papers reviewed formulated theories at Explanation & Prediction level. Specific research themes in that category related to LSAD frameworks (1), LSAD transformation (1) and LSAD enterprise architecture (1). More specifically the theories at the Explanation & Prediction level related to the following findings from literature:

- Coordinating planning meetings [S16]
- Success factors of large-scale agile transformation [S33]
- Challenges of large-scale agile implementations [S33]
- The need for an Agile Enterprise Architecture [S37]

4) *Design & Action theories*

The Design & Action level type of theory stipulates how to do something. It is about the principles of form and function, methods, and justificatory theoretical knowledge that are used in the development of IS (Gregor, 2006). As can be seen in Table III, 7 of the papers reviewed formulated theories at Design & Action level. Specific research themes in that category related to LSAD frameworks (2), LSAD transformation (2), LSAD software development issues (1) and LSAD teams (2). More specifically the theories at the Design & Action level related to the following findings from literature:

- Hybrid framework recommendations [S2]
- Recommendations on how to coordinate planning meetings [S16]
- Recommendations on how to handle release planning [S21]
- Recommendations on large-scale agile training [S18]
- Recommendations on how to handle teams' challenges [S24]
- Recommendations on when to embark on large scale agile transformation [S7]
- Recommendations on how to succeed in large scale agile transformation [S19]

Prediction theories provide testable propositions without well-developed justificatory causal explanations. Such theories say what is and what will be in future. None of the papers reviewed theorized at that level.

IV. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

The paper sought to synthesize and analyze the research trends and provide a synopsis on the levels of theorization in LSAD research. In doing so, the study carried out a systematic literature review of studies carried out in the last five years in LSAD with a special focus on large financial institutions (2016 to 2020). The study found associative relations between the level of theorization and research trends over time. The findings indicated an increasing interest in the LSAD with an emphasis on analysis level of theorization.

Most of the literature explored in this study were mostly focused on the LSAD Transformation theme, whereas LSAD Teams and LSAD Frameworks were subsequently second and third. LSAD Enterprise Architecture and LSAD Software development issues are also other themes that were derived from the literature review. This study shows that there is a broader interest around LSAD and that researchers are not just interested in frameworks or architectures, but also a variety of other types of interest in this field.

The analysis theories are the most basic theories and are indicative of early level theory building. The findings imply that LSAD research has not yet matured to the high levels of explanative and predictive theories that are characteristic of a maturing field. Thus, providing future research opportunities to explore casual and correlational studies that are crucial to new theory avenues.

The study concedes that analytic theory is necessary for the development of all the other types of theory. However, a clear definition and validation of constructs is needed for effective theory formulation. As such, theory for predicting as well as explaining & predicting are needed as the building blocks for theory development needs to be further explored. This is particularly relevant to themes related to software development issues, frameworks, and enterprise architecture.

While the Design theory that is informed by all the other classes of theory provides opportunities for future research. The EP theory can be quite useful LSAD studies in future who focus on the large financial services industry. Predictive theory focusing on LSAD Teams in the financial sector could greatly benefit future research as this is a domain that has not been explored in full yet and would aid in guiding future research on other theories as well.

- [1] Alqudah, M., & Razali, R. (2016). A review of scaling agile methods in large software development. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, 6(6), 828-837.
- [2] Alzoubi, Y. I., & Gill, A. Q. (2020). An Empirical Investigation of Geographically Distributed Agile Development: The Agile Enterprise Architecture is a Communication Enabler. *IEEE Access*, 8, 80269-80289. Barroca, L., Dingsøy, T., & Mikalsen, M. (2019, May). Agile transformation: a summary and research agenda from the first international workshop. In *International Conference on Agile Software Development* (pp. 3-9). Springer, Cham.
- [3] Bass, J. M. (2016). Artefacts and agile method tailoring in large-scale offshore software development programmes. *Information and Software Technology*, 75, 1-16.
- [4] Berkani, A., Causse, D., & Thomas, L. (2019). Triggers analysis of an agile transformation: the case of a central bank. *Procedia Computer Science*, 164, 449-456.
- [5] Capovilla, L. (2019). The role of experiments in the quest for product/market fit: structuring business uncertainty through Agile methodologies (Bachelor's thesis, Università Ca'Foscari Venezia).
- [6] Cepeda, J. (2019). Agile Project Management Methodology applied in large software development projects (Doctoral dissertation, Dublin Business School).
- [7] CollabNet, VersionOne. (2020). 14th Annual State of Agile Report. <https://www.stateofagile.com>. 2020
- [8] Conboy, K., & Carroll, N. (2019). Implementing large-scale agile frameworks: challenges and recommendations. *IEEE Software*, 36(2), 44-50.
- [9] Crowston, K., Chudoba, K., Watson-Manheim, M. B., & Rahmati, P. (2016, May). Inter-team coordination in large-scale agile development: A test of organizational discontinuity theory. In *Proceedings of the Scientific Workshop Proceedings of XP2016* (pp. 1-5).
- [10] De Souza, J. V. (2020). Moving from traditional to Agile information systems development in a large organisation: two complementary models of organisational Agile implementation (Doctoral dissertation, Curtin University).
- [11] Dikert, K., Paasivaara, M., & Lassenius, C. (2016). Challenges and success factors for large-scale agile transformations: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 119, 87-108.
- [12] Dorp, T. V. (2019). Agile Teams: Experienced Work Characteristics and Their Effects on Employees' Perceived Job Performance and Happiness at Work (Master's thesis).
- [13] Dumitriu, F., Meşniță, G., & Radu, L. D. (2019). Challenges and Solutions of Applying Large-Scale Agile at Organizational Level. *Informatica Economica*, 23(3), 61-71.
- [14] Dybå, T., & Dingsøy, T. (2008). Empirical studies of agile software development: A systematic review. *Information and software technology*, 50(9-10), 833-859.
- [15] Gregor, S. (2006). The nature of theory in information systems. *MIS quarterly*, 611-642.
- [16] Gustavsson, T. (2019, May). Changes over time in a planned inter-team coordination routine. In *International Conference on Agile Software Development* (pp. 105-111). Springer, Cham.
- [17] Gustavsson, T. (2019, May). Voices from the teams-impacts on autonomy in large-scale agile software development settings. In *International Conference on Agile Software Development* (pp. 29-36). Springer, Cham.
- [18] Henriques, V., & Tanner, M. (2017). A systematic literature review of agile and maturity model research. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 12, 053-073.
- [19] Hukkelberg, I., & Berntzen, M. (2019, May). Exploring the challenges of integrating data science roles in agile autonomous teams. In *International Conference on Agile Software Development* (pp. 37-45). Springer, Cham.
- [20] Hussain, N. (2018). Requirements Engineering for Globally Distributed Teams using Scaled Agile Framework.
- [21] Kärki, A. (2020). The Impact of Education and Training in Large-scale Agile Transformation.

[22] Karpik, K. (2018). Large Scale Agile Transformation: Challenges and Success Factors of Talent Management in Large Financial Institutions.

[23] Kasauli, R. (2020). Requirements Engineering that Balances Agility of Teams and System-level Information Needs at Scale (Doctoral dissertation, Chalmers University of Technology).

[24] Keele, S. (2007). Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering (Vol. 5). Technical report, Ver. 2.3 EBSE Technical Report. EBSE.

[25] Kettunen, P., Laanti, M., Fagerholm, F., Mikkonen, T., & Männistö, T. (2019, May). Finnish enterprise agile transformations: a survey study. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 97-104). Springer, Cham.

[26] Kilu, E. (2018). Software Process Improvement Using Agile Methods in Financial Institutions. LHV Bank Case (Masters Dissertation, University of Tartu)"

[27] Laanti, M., & Kettunen, P. (2019, May). SAFe adoptions in Finland: a survey research. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 81-87). Springer, Cham.

[28] Mako, T. (2019). Leadership challenges of large-scale agile transformations (MBA dissertation, University of Pretoria).

[29] Martini, A., Stray, V., & Moe, N. B. (2019, May). Technical-, social-and process debt in large-scale agile: an exploratory case-study. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 112-119). Springer, Cham.

[30] Mikalsen, M., Næsje, M., Reime, E. A., & Solem, A. (2019, May). Agile Autonomous Teams in Complex Organizations. In XP Workshops (pp. 55-63).

[31] Moe, N. B., & Mikalsen, M. (2020, June). Large-Scale Agile Transformation: A Case Study of Transforming Business, Development and Operations. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 115-131). Springer, Cham.

[32] Mishra, P. (2018). Quality Deployment and Use of the Scaled Agile Framework®-Managing teamwork and software quality in the banking sector (Master's thesis).

[33] Nagarajan, A. D. (2018). DevOps implementation framework for Agile-based large financial organizations (Master's thesis).

[34] Petit, Y., & Marnewick, C. (2019, May). Earn your wings: a novel approach to deployment governance. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 64-71). Springer, Cham.

[35] Rodriguez Leon, A., & Singh, K. (2020). Adoption hurdles faced by organizations embracing SAFe®.

[36] Roman, G. D. C. (2016). Characterizing the presence of agility in large-scale agile software development.

[37] Salameh, A., & Bass, J. M. (2019, May). Spotify tailoring for promoting effectiveness in cross-functional autonomous squads. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 20-28). Springer, Cham.

[38] Schön, E. M., Radtke, D., & Jordan, C. (2020, June). Improving Risk Management in a Scaled Agile Environment. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 132-141). Springer, Cham.

[39] Schryen, G. (2015). Writing qualitative is literature reviews—guidelines for synthesis, interpretation, and guidance of research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 37(1), 12.

[40] Theobald, S., Schmitt, A., & Diebold, P. (2019, May). Comparing scaling agile frameworks based on underlying practices. In International Conference on Agile Software Development (pp. 88-96). Springer, Cham.

[41] Turner, J. R., Thurlow, N., Baker, R., Northcutt, D., & Newman, K. (2019). Multiteam systems in an agile environment: a realist systematic review. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*.

[42] Uludag, Ö., Kleehaus, M., Reiter, N., & Matthes, F. (2019). What to Expect from Enterprise Architects in Large-Scale Agile Development? A Multiple-Case Study.

[43] Uludag, Ö., Kleehaus, M., Xu, X., & Matthes, F. (2017, October). Investigating the role of architects in scaling agile frameworks. In 2017 IEEE 21st International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference (EDOC) (pp. 123-132). IEEE.

[44] Uludag, Ö., Philipp, P., Putta, A., Paasivaara, M., Lassenius, C., & Matthes, F. (2020). Revealing the State-of-the-Art in Large-Scale Agile

Development: A Systematic Mapping Study. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.05578.

[45] van Eck, J. (2018). Innovation in a large scale agile organisation: A case study of ABN AMRO.

[46] Uludag, Ö., Philipp, P., Putta, A., Paasivaara, M., Lassenius, C., & Matthes, F. (2020). Revealing the State-of-the-Art in Large-Scale Agile Development: A Systematic Mapping Study. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.05578.

APPENDIX I

Paper Number	Short Source
[S1]	(Moe & Mikalsen, 2020)
[S2]	(Schön, Radtke, & Jordan, 2020)
[S3]	(Alqudah, & Razali, 2016)
[S4]	(Alzoubi & Gill, 2020)
[S5]	(Bass, 2016)
[S6]	(Berkani, Causse, & Thomas, 2019)
[S7]	(Nagarajan, 2018)
[S8]	(Capovilla, 2019)
[S9]	(Cepeda, 2019)
[S10]	(Crowston, Chudoba, Watson-Manheim, & Rahmati, 2016)
[S11]	(Dikert, Paasivaara, & Lassenius, 2016)
[S12]	(Dorp, 2019)
[S13]	(Dumitriu, Meşniță, & Radu, 2019)
[S14]	(Gustavsson, 2019a)
[S15]	(Gustavsson, 2019b)
[S16]	(Hussain, 2018)
[S17]	(De Souza, 2020)
[S18]	(Kärki, 2020)
[S19]	(Karpik, 2018)
[S20]	(Kasauli, 2020)
[S21]	(Kilu, 2018)
[S22]	(Barroca, Dingsøyr, & Mikalsen, 2019)
[S23]	(Salameh & Bass, 2019)
[S24]	(Hukkelberg & Bemtzen, 2019)
[S25]	(Mikalsen, Næsje, Reime, & Solem, 2019)
[S26]	(Petit & Marnewick, 2019)
[S27]	(Laanti & Kettunen, 2019)
[S28]	(Theobald, Schmitt, & Diebold, 2019)
[S29]	(Kettunen, Laanti, Fagerholm, Mikkonen, & Männistö, 2019)
[S30]	(Martini, Stray, & Moe, 2019)
[S31]	(Mako, 2019)
[S32]	(Mishra, 2018)
[S33]	(Rodriguez & Singh, 2020).
[S34]	(Roman, 2016)
[S35]	(Turner, Thurlow, Baker, Northcutt, & Newman, 2019)
[S36]	(Uludag, Kleehaus, Reiter, & Matthes, 2019)
[S37]	(Uludag, Kleehaus, Xu, & Matthes, 2017)
[S38]	(Uludag, Philipp, Putta, Paasivaara, Lassenius, & Matthes, 2020)
[S39]	(Van Eck, 2018)