The recent COVID-19 crisis fundamentally changed the way car manufacturers operate. Although the automotive industry experienced disruption in CASE (Connectivity, Autonomy, Sharing, Electrification) over recent years, the implications of today’s COVID-19 crisis for incumbent car manufacturers are unprecedented (Choi, 2020; Genzlinger, Zejnilovic, & Bustinza, 2020; Ivanov, 2020; Venter, Aunan, Chowdhury, & Lelieveld, 2020; Wang & Wells, 2020). The unprecedented nature of this industry transformation is reflected in new ways of collaborating (in many business areas remote), change in risk tolerance (higher risk-taking by managers), increased time spent on strategic as opposed to operational challenges by top-management-teams (TMTs), and increased use of agile ways of working throughout the organisation as a strategy and implementation tool (Ivanov, 2020; Ivanov & Dolgui, 2020; Kano & Oh, 2020; Lawton, Dorobantu, Rajwani, & Sun, 2020; Shepherd, 2020; Wang & Wells, 2020). This paper focuses on the latter.

While there are various definitions and conceptualizations of agile ways of working, this paper refers to approaches that reflect the three principles of agile: (a) “An obsession with continuously adding more value for customers,” (b) “small teams working on small tasks in short iterative work cycles,” and (c) “coordinating work in a fluid, interactive network” (Denning, 2018a: 10). Agile ways of working aim at providing a result that better fits the customers’ needs faster, thereby improving business effectiveness and efficiency (Ghezzi & Cavallo, 2020; Gomes, Sousa, & Vendrell-Herrero, 2020; Roberts & Grover, 2012). Agile approaches can be found across organizational hierarchies and functions (Ivory & Brooks, 2018).

Agile working methods were initially used in software development and are increasingly being employed in other business areas (Anossi, Foss, & Martini, 2020). Beyond the established literature on agile in software development (Anossi et al., 2020; Ramesh, Mohan, & Cao, 2012; Uludag, Kleehaus, Dreymann, Kabelin, & Matthes, 2019), prior studies investigated how the concept of agile can be used in digital transformation (Al-Ali & Phaal, 2019; Ghezzi & Cavallo, 2020; Li, Wu, Cao, & Wang, 2021; Moi & Cabiddu, 2020; Sjödin, Parida, Kohtamäki, & Wincent, 2020), international business (Shams, Vrontis, Belyaeva, Ferraris, & Czinkota, 2020), human resource management (Denning, 2018b;
Xing, Liu, Boojihawan, & Tarba, 2020), research and development (Pearson, Costley, Phaal, & Nuttall, 2020), and operations management, especially in the production and supply chain management context (Srinivasan, Srivastava, & Iyer, 2020; Tavani, Sharifi, & Ismail, 2014).

Although some publications addressed agile ways of working as a strategy tool, they lack empirical underpinning and do not cover firms experiencing unprecedented industry transformation. This paper refers to the term strategy tool as a vehicle to identify and explore market opportunities (Rengarajan, Moser, & Narayananurthy, 2021). Prior papers referring to agile approaches as a strategy tool are conceptual (Denning, 2018a; Holbeche, 2019; Ivory & Brooks, 2018; Srinivasan et al., 2020; Thrassou, Vrontis, & Bresciani, 2018), provide some examples but lack the depths a single case study can offer and do not explain how firms implemented agile in the strategy context (Annosi et al., 2020; Denning, 2017a, 2017b, 2019; Doz & Kosonen, 2010), or focus on niche aspects of agility in the strategy context, like cultural barriers that constrain managers’ agile decision-making (Hodgkinson, Ravishankar, & Fischer, 2017) or evaluation of innovative ideas (Dziallas, 2020). The conceptual studies mainly rephrase the well-established dynamic capabilities literature, heavily influenced by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997).

Beyond, scholars introduce terminologies and theorise about “organisational agility” (Walter, 2020) and “strategic agility” (Denning, 2017a; Doz & Kosonen, 2010; Xing et al., 2020), or more exotic terms, like “international marketing agility” (Gomes et al., 2020) and “strategic marketing multicultural agility pendulum” (Thrassou et al., 2018). Neither surprising nor novel, some papers suggest a positive correlation of adaptability and business performance (Ivory & Brooks, 2018; Srinivasan et al., 2020) - the core argument of the dynamic capabilities literature (D. J. Teece, 2000; D. J. Teece et al., 1997).

How firms implement agile approaches as a strategy tool in the face of unprecedented industry transformation remains unexplored. As detailed earlier, this paper does not refer to unprecedented industry transformation as upgrading of products, but to fundamentally changing business ways (Pearson et al., 2020). It is essential to investigate this issue as adaptability is at the core of agile (Conboy, 2009; Holweg, 2005). It is pressing to examine this issue now as agility is arguably more important for businesses’ survival than ever given the unprecedented pace and magnitude of change (Buzzaqo & Rizzi, 2020; Kaviani, Tavana, Kowsari, & Rezapour, 2020; Teece, 2020). The current external dynamic provides an unparalleled opportunity to explore the concept of agile in the strategy context further.

This paper explores how agile methods can be used as a strategy tool to manage incumbents through times of unprecedented industry transformation. Thereby, it goes beyond conceptualizations and prior attempts to improve empirical evidence of how firms use agile to explore and exploit market opportunities. The research question “How can agile ways of working be used as a strategy tool to respond to unprecedented industry transformation?” guides the present study.

This paper uses the case of sales in the automotive industry during the COVID-19 crisis. The case is particularly well suited to study agile ways of working as a strategy tool since it is an established industry in terms of operations that did not disrupt to the degree of the recent COVID-19 crisis before (Venter, Aunan, Chowdhury, & Lelleveld, 2020; Wang & Wells, 2020). The business area of sales is appropriate since it is most affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, received utmost management attention and required fundamental transformation (Gersdorf, Hertze, Schauffuss, & Schenk, 2020; Hauser et al., 2020; Poberschnigg, Pimenta, & Hilletofth, 2020). Specifically, this paper draws on 18 interviews with managers at a premium manufacturer based in Asia, providing in-depth insights into the management of the recent COVID-19 crisis, focusing on but looking beyond sales.

The contribution of this study is twofold. Theoretically, this paper contributes to our understanding of incumbents’ adoption to unprecedented industry transformation by providing a rich narrative that details how a car manufacturer implemented agile ways of working as a strategy tool. It specifies the organizational design, leadership structures, goal setting, top management team (TMT) time allocation, and the iterative strategy approach. Although earlier studies emphasized specific roles and agile management processes, this study finds that these frameworks are somewhat less important. Specifically, the case study highlights that it is crucial to focus on six fundamental principles. Empirically, this paper contributes to our knowledge of car manufacturers’ responses to the recent COVID-19 crisis, focusing on but not limited to sales. Thereby, it might help business leaders to understand the crisis’s implications for their business and inspire approaches to respond to it. Besides, regulators might benefit from the study as it indicates how the regulatory framework might benefit from adaptation.

The remainder of this study is organized as follows. The theoretical background and context of this study are provided in the subsequent section. Section 3 details the methodology, specifying the research design and automotive case. Section 4 entails the findings, which are discussed in the section after that. Finally, Section 6 covers the conclusion and outlines avenues for future research.

2 | LITERATURE REVIEW

Agility refers to the ability to adapt to dynamically changing environments (Conboy, 2009). Working in an agile way implies learning from recent experiences while applying knowledge acquired previously to deliver results that best meet customer needs, given time and budget constraints (Denning, 2018b). Hence, volatility, flexibility, learning, and adaption are characteristic of agile approaches (Shams et al., 2020). This section reviews the emergence and key characteristics of agile to lay the foundation for understanding the strategic context concept, covering agile software development and business research.

2.1 | Agile in software development

Agile found first widespread adoption in software development. Agile development refers to a range of agility-facilitating practices for improving software development. They are characterized by customer-centricity (i.e., focusing actions on adding value to customers), continuous delivery and improvement, and collaboration within and across teams (Sambamurthy, Bharadwaj, & Grover, 2003). Agile software
development is frequently used in combination with other methods, such as Kanban, Scrum, and Lean (Wolff, Brönnner, Held, & Lienkamp, 2020). Although these methods are considered distinct, they share attributes, like “leanness,” that is, maximizing business outcomes while minimizing waste, such as underutilized resources and unnecessarily complicated processes (Kumar Singh & Modgil, 2020).

Agile software development methods share an underlying philosophy, which covers four principles and values: (a) individuals and interaction, (b) working software, (c) customer collaboration, and (d) responding to change (Campanelli & Parreiras, 2015). Although these principles and values are abstract, they have been specified in today's widely used agile software development (Ramesh et al., 2012). The widely adopted methods are characterized by discovering customer needs and developing solutions through collaborative efforts of self-organizing and cross-functional teams, engaging with end customers (Collier, 2011). Minimal upfront planning and maximal customer involvement in the development lifecycle are critical in agile software development (O'Everby, Bharadwaj, & Sambamurthy, 2006).

Agile software development is associated with potential challenges. Some studies report that ambiguous benefits, lack of predictability, ownership and accountability, and deployment difficulties are among the potential shortcomings (Annosi et al., 2020; Conboy, 2009). However, these potential challenges might stem from implementation errors (e.g., lack of individualization of agile guidelines) and are not agile methodology inherent (Campanelli & Parreiras, 2015).

Firms widely agree that the benefits of agile software development outweigh potential drawbacks in most use cases. Among the reported benefits are faster product delivery (Gomes et al., 2020), cost savings (Pearson et al., 2020), improved customer satisfaction (Comella-Dorda et al., 2017), and improved employee satisfaction (Denning, 2018; Hodgkinson et al., 2017). As a result, agile ways of working are the status quo in software development today.

2.2 Agile in business research

Beyond software development, agile ways of working found their way into the domain of business research, including operations, organizations, and strategy research (e.g., Ghezzi & Cavallo, 2020; Holweg, 2005; Moi & Cabiddu, 2020; Tavani et al., 2014; Uludag et al., 2019). However, the idea that adaption to changing business environments is critical for long-term survival is not new and, among others, core to the dynamic capabilities concept (Helfat et al., 2007; Teece et al., 1997). Dynamic capabilities are defined as “firm’s ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments” (Teece et al., 1997:516). Earlier studies conceptualize strategic agility as a combination of different dynamic capabilities, such as strategic sensitivity and resource fluidity (Doz & Kosonen, 2010; Ivory & Brooks, 2018). Others highlight the blurred conceptual boundaries further and describe agility to be also “known as dynamic capability” (Gurkov, Goldberg, & Savidov, 2017:18).

Although the key message remains the same (agile firms are more successful than others), recently, agility has been specified in the context of organizational adaption and responding to changing customer needs. Organizational agility has been coined as companies’ ability to adapt organizational structures flexibly and quickly to changes in the business environment (Teece, Peteraf, & Leh, 2016; Walter, 2020). Associated challenges include managing the tension of running the core business while setting-up the organization for exploring potential future profit pools (O’Reilly & Tushman, 2008). Customer agility has been defined as the “degree to which a firm is able to sense and respond quickly to customer-base opportunities for innovation and competitive action” (Roberts & Grover, 2012:580). These two and other specific conceptualizations of agility in business research highlight the importance of continuous adaption for innovating successfully and long-term firm survival (Björkdahl, 2020; Gordon, Ramic, Rohrbeck, & Spaniol, 2020).

The exploration of agile ways of working in the strategy context remains conceptual and lacks empirical underpinning. Earlier studies provide some examples but do not detail how firms implemented agile in the strategy context (Annosi et al., 2020; Denning, 2017a, 2017b, 2019; Dza & Kosonen, 2010), or focus on niche elements in the context of strategy research, such as cultural barriers that constrain managers’ agile decision-making (Hodgkinson et al., 2017) and evaluation of innovative ideas (Dziallas, 2020). Conceptual studies mainly rephrase the literature on dynamic capabilities. They do not add to our understanding of how firms use agile ways of working to improve strategy development and implementation iteratively. Particularly firms experiencing unprecedented external dynamism might be insightful to learn more about the concept as the adaption to change is at the core of agility; a quest this study has taken on.

3 METHODOLOGY

To explore how agile has been and can be used as a strategy tool in the face of unprecedented industry transformation, an in-depth, inductive single-firm case study has been conducted. Case studies allow the observation of complex relational processes and are well suited for discovering new insights in theoretically novel phenomena (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994), such as agile ways of working as a strategy tool. The methodology allows exploring the phenomenon from a practical perspective, involving informants from a range of organizational hierarchies and functions.

3.1 Case selection

Purposeful sampling has been used to identify a suitable case study that is informative about the phenomenon of interest (Strauss, 1987). The case study had to reflect certain characteristics. First, it had to be in a global industry not to be subject to local or regional specificities (e.g., regulation or unique consumer preferences) and embedded in global flows of goods and information to provide meaningful insights beyond the specific context. Second, the industry had to be well-established and relevant to many people (e.g., employees and customers) to provide rich insights that might hold for other industries.
Third, the company would have to be an orchestrating player in the industry that has been affected by unprecedented industry transformation since niche players are affected by major changes in different ways depending on their role in the value chains. Finally, the company must have used agile forms of working as a strategy tool in response to the unprecedented industry transformation to provide insights into the phenomenon of interest.

All of the criteria are met by an Asian-based car manufacturer. The car manufacturer is the national subsidiary of one of the ten largest car manufacturers in one of the world's largest car markets (International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers, 2018). The manufacturer used agile as a strategy tool to respond to the recent COVID-19 pandemic in their most affected business area, sales. Sales divisions have been most affected by the crisis and promise to provide rich insights since it is the car manufacturer's link to the end consumers, including the sales process and vehicle delivery, and involving their national dealership network (Agrawal et al., 2020; Wang & Wells, 2020).

### 3.2 Data collection

Primary data was collected via semistructured interviews, involving different functions and organizational hierarchies, including the chief executive officer (CEO). The initial interview guide and focus of the interviews evolved iteratively with increasing knowledge about agile as a strategy tool at the car manufacturer (Eisenhardt, 1989; Miles & Huberman, 1994). A combination of purposive and snowball sampling has been used to identify the interviewees most knowledgeable about the construct of interest (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). A total of 18 interviews was conducted. The interview duration averaged approximately 1 hr. All interviews were conducted via Zoom, recorded (audio and/or video), and transcribed verbatim (Bryman, 2012).

### 3.3 Data analysis

The within-case analysis was used to iteratively gather and analyze data (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). Supported by the software NVivo, data coding and analysis of the transcripts followed the subsequent steps: (a) coding by identifying key terms and assigning interview sections to them (Miles & Huberman, 1994), (b) identifying relationships between key terms and iteratively evolving the categorizations until data saturation is reached (Strauss & Corbin, 1994), (c) using thematic analysis to identify common meanings and patterns (e.g., “leadership”) in the themes emerged (Braun & Clarke, 2006), and (d) reflecting on and cross-checking of findings with interviewees. Table 1 illustrates the NVivo code structure.

In the following, a section is devoted to each theme.

### 4 FINDINGS

During the COVID-19 crisis, car manufacturers experienced disruption in various business areas. The crisis has accelerated online, and direct-to-consumer sales as people have become more comfortable working from home and buying remotely (Agrawal et al., 2020; Wang & Wells, 2020). This study’s car manufacturer case acknowledged the need to transform its business fast. To transform its business, the company shifted to an agile management type system. The strategic direction (“where to change”) was set by the TMT, and they still had the conventional vertical departments (e.g., marketing, sales, service, finance). However, horizontally they worked with transformational teams. These cross-functional teams created MVPs to understand the implications of recent developments by iteratively testing and learning in the market.

The TMT time allocation shifted from 10% on strategic issues pre-COVID-19 to about 60% on strategic issues during the crisis. In this respect, COVID-19 has been driving the transformation. Managers were sitting at home, had time to think about, talk about and clarify strategic issues. They run the cross-functional teams with MVPs and quarterly objectives and key results (OKRs). OKR is a goal-setting framework for defining and tracking goals and business outcomes (Zhou & He, 2018). Thereby, the company uses Silicon Valley software development type tools to transform their business (Charan, Barton, & Carey, 2018). The car manufacturer ran five MVPs in total. This study looks deeper into two of them: “online sales” and “no-hassle pricing.” The five MVPs run in parallel to the core business.

### 4.1 Online sales MVP

Their first MVP was an early version of “online sales”—a button on their website that says “buy online.” When customers pressed that button, they were connected to a dealership via phone or Skype, doing everything they would normally do (offline), just online. The car manufacturer trained their dealers and sales consultants on using video calls to build a relationship with their customers. Thereby, it was essential to acknowledge that this first MVP for selling cars online was not perfect, but an adapted and working version of the status quo. To implement their first MVP, the car manufacturer mapped out an entire customer journey regarding how this new system should work, using components they already have, instead of investing in new features (Deloitte, 2018). After the second lockdown in

### TABLE 1 NVivo code structure

| First-order codes | Second-order codes |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Online sales minimum viable product (MVP) | Customer journey transformation Dealership network collaboration Infrastructure redesign |
| No-hassle pricing MVP | Price-related pain points Dealership regulations Transformation program setup |
| Key learnings | MVP synergies Implementation over planning Performance management Empowering leadership |
Another of the car manufacturer’s MVPs is no-hassle pricing, offering one fixed price per vehicle model, as Tesla has been from the beginning. Conventionally, customers walk into the dealership and have to negotiate (Wesseling, Niesten, Faber, & Hekkert, 2015). Most people seem to dislike it, but no one seems to be ever-changing it (Schmidt, 2020). One key enabler of online sales is pricing since negotiations are no longer feasible, and customers appreciate price certainty.

By offering the MVP, they had to comply with regional price legislation. Specifically, they cannot dictate dealers for what price to sell the car (Bansal & Kockelman, 2017). However, they can set up their margin system so that it does not help dealers to negotiate. Hence, they shifted to a paper activity model as opposed to a margin model for cars. Thereby, they paid dealers for offering services, like test drives and vehicle deliveries, instead of giving them margin. At the same time, they announced the final vehicle price on their website.

Changing the car manufacturer’s contracts with the dealerships and the relationship to them tests their trust. It is a tough decision for the dealers because it affects their margin. They are scared and do not think “the car manufacturer wants the best for us;” but rather “I hear that they want to sell cars direct to end consumers.” Hence, the car manufacturer designed the system in collaboration with the dealers and started small with the rollout. Critical in the program setup was the communication and close engagement with the dealerships.

As a result of the new model, (a) dealers are making more money, (b) more cars are being sold, and (c) the customers are happier because they have price certainty. The broader aim was to learn how to execute pricing in a digital environment and remunerate dealers. Every time the car manufacturer launches a new car, they introduce it with this new model. Then, they integrate it in the end-to-end process until they have the one price logic for all models and with the same remuneration model for all dealers.

### 4.3 Key learnings

The car manufacturer uses the MVPs to develop and improve their systems continuously. For example, they learned that they will introduce online car purchase, but will keep the option to talk to employees online since customers seem to like it. They discovered that they need to ramp up their call centers, what technical system requirements they need, and what service capabilities are required to care about customers online.

The car manufacturer also sought to create synergies between MVPs. For example, one of the other MVPs is “direct to consumer relationships,” building on learnings from online sales and no-hassle pricing. There they picked 100 customers and serviced all of their vehicles directly, instead of the dealership. Now they are implementing a second and more advanced version of the MVPs.

A key takeaway for the car manufacturer was learning through MVPs by implementing agile ways of working as a strategy tool. A manager stated that “People spend too much time on strategy. The strategy is set. We know where the industry is going. Now, how do we get there? You have to stop planning and start doing and learning. When the plan hits the real world, that is where the learning is happening. You learn about what kind of capabilities you are missing; you learn about these gaps. And you are doing it at a small scale, so you are not messing up the rest of the business.” The TMT laid out the framework, and the people lit up by it by not doing the mundane work. Their day job became to reinvent. The framework refers to the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) system the TMT laid out, covering three KPIs the firms had to hit every month: A profit number, a car (sales) number and a service number. Meeting the three KPIs was everyone’s day job, and no one lost track of that.

Another manager emphasized that “When you get people doing things in a transformation instead of just planning and thinking about it, it is a completely different feel.” For example, the cross-functional teams working on the remuneration model had to call and convince the dealers. They had to listen to what the dealers say, designing the system with them. They could do this on a smaller scale and in a low-risk environment. Thereby, they learned and gained the dealers’ trust and then rolled the MVP out. Another manager added, “Although there were some tensions along the way, it is exciting for the employees. They do not want to do the same things month on month. They want part of their job to be interesting, innovative, different and challenging.”

Bringing line employees to do strategic work proved to be important in the transformation. Line employees are good at executing
work, but a detailed plan does not provide much excitement. Asking them to take responsibility and explore something new does energize them. One employee referred to this change as “the real transformation.” The TMT described agile as a great tool that enabled human capital to drive the transformation. The CEO summarized: “Agile has been a game-changer for us. I just went out there and felt like I have to make some sense of it. How am I going to do this? I just started with a quick Google search to learn about agile, and now we are deep into it. I think we are onto something here. Using agile principles to turn strategy into reality by doing it is something all leaders have to figure out. The days of building a massive plan and hoping that you made all the right decisions before any customer sees it are gone. You are never going to keep up with the speed of change if you are operating like that.”

5 | DISCUSSION

This study was designed to explore the use of agile ways of working as a strategy tool in the face of unprecedented industry transformation. The case of sales in the automotive industry provided rich empirical insights into how a car manufacturer used agile ways of working during the COVID-19 pandemic to identify and explore market opportunities. The main takeaway is that agile can be used as a strategy tool by involving capabilities across the organization in an iterative strategy process.

5.1 | Theoretical contributions

Theoretically, this study adds to our understanding of agile ways of working in the strategy context. Although prior studies introduced terms like “organizational agility” and “strategic agility” (Denning, 2017a; Walter, 2020; Xing et al., 2020), they lack empirical underpinning and do not cover firms involved in unprecedented industry transformation. This paper provides a rich narrative, detailing how a car manufacturer implemented agile ways of working as a strategy tool. It specifies the organizational design, leadership structures, goal setting, TMT time allocation, and iterative strategy process.

Although earlier studies emphasized specific team roles and agile management processes, this study finds that these frameworks are somewhat less important. Specifically, the case study highlights that it is crucial to consider six fundamental principles: (a) having a clear direction of where to take the company, underpinned by TMT commitment, (b) having a small set (e.g., three units) of KPIs that all employees work towards and that are reflected in their daily activities, (c) collaborating sensitively with key partners, (d) choosing MVPs that add value to customers and enable organizational learning, (e) listening to employees in terms of their preferences to get involved in and contribute to the agile strategy process, and (f) getting started and ensuring continuous learning about improving the agile strategy process. Thereby, this study complements earlier and mainly conceptual work.

5.2 | Managerial implications

In terms of managerial implications, this study provides automotive managers concrete examples of how to implement agile as a strategy tool, detailing the automotive industry’s specificities (Jacobides, Macduffie, & Tae, 2016; Macduffie & Fujimoto, 2010). Hence, this study might be relevant for managers at car manufacturers and another automotive stakeholder, such as suppliers and regulators, by offering insights into nuances of the recent automotive developments during the COVID-19 crisis, focusing on automotive sales. Specifically, the paper might be useful for suppliers by inspiring ideas for positioning their companies well to transition towards online sales and fixed vehicle prices (Poberschnigg et al., 2020; Tordjman & Rehberg, 2019). Regulators might benefit from the study by understanding car manufacturers’ measures to implement these two developments and derive how the regulatory framework might benefit from adaptation (Harrison & Thiel, 2017).

Managers from industries other than automotive might find this study relevant as well. The general principles identified might hold for industries of different size and structure (Sturgeon & Van Biesebroek, 2011). By adopting the principles and reflecting on the practical implementation examples provided, managers might identify meaningful use cases to leverage their resources.

6 | FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research could add to the knowledge of agile ways of working as a strategy tool by investigating how different types of firms (e.g., established suppliers and new entrants) or firms in other industries (e.g., retail and education) use agile approaches to respond to unprecedented industry transformation, such as the recent COVID-19 crisis (Shepherd, 2020; Wang & Wells, 2020). This study emphasizes that particular attention might be paid to goal setting (e.g., via OKRs) and leadership behavior, which seems to be success-critical determinants (Kloner, Gerpott, & Parker, 2020; Zhou & He, 2018).

Future studies might also look deeper into different roles across organizational hierarchies and functions involved in using agile in the strategy context. Specifically, the research could understand the causal relationships between different hierarchies and functions, and agile experiments’ performance outcomes (Slade Shantz, Kistruck, Pacheco, & Webb, 2020). Thereby, studies might identify best practices and derive critical success factors, improving conceptual understanding and providing guidance to managers.
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