#### REFERENCE LIST

- Altuwaijri, M. M., & Khorsheed, M. S. (2012). InnoDiff: A project-based model for successful IT innovation diffusion. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(2012), 37–47.
- Al-Jabri, I. V. M., & Sohail, M. V. S. (2012). Mobile banking adoption: Application of diffusion of innovation theory, *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 13(4), 379-391.
- Apulu, I., & Latham, A. (2011). An evaluation of the impact of information and communication technologies: Two case study examples. *International Business Research*, 4 (3), 3-9.
- Austin, R., & Devin, L. (2003). Beyond requirements: Software making as art. *IEEE Software*, 20(1), 93–95.
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). Methods of social research. Canada: Maxwell Macmillan Inc.
- Binder, J., Aillaud, L., & Schilli, L. (2014). The project management cocktail model: An approach for balancing agile and ISO 21500. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 119, 182 191.
- Boehm, B., & Turner, R. (2004). Balancing agility and discipline: Evaluating and integrating agile and plan-driven methods. In *26th International Conference on Software Engineering*, (pp 718-719), retrieved from http://ieeexplore.ieee. org/abstract/document /1317503/?reload=true
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: The Gulford Press.
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). Structural equation modelling with AMOS-Basic concepts, applications, and programming. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Chau, P. Y. K. & Tam, K. Y. (1997) Factors affecting the adoption of open systems: An exploratory study. *MIS Quarterly*, 21(1), pp 1-24.

- Chin, G. (2004). Agile project management: how to succeed in the face of changing project requirements. New York: AMACOM.
- Chow, T., & Cao, D. (2008). A survey study of critical success factors in agile software projects. *The Journal of Systems and Software*, 81, 961–971.
- Chow, T., Cao, D. (2008). A survey study of critical success factors in agile software projects. *The Journal of Systems and Software*, 81(2008) 961–971.
- Chuang, S., Luor, T., & Lu, H. (2014). Assessment of institutions, scholars, and contributions on agile software development (2001–2012). *The Journal of Systems and Software*, 93, 84–101.
- Conforto, E. C., & Amaral, D. C. (2008). Evaluating an agile method for planning and controlling innovative projects. *Project Management Journal*, 41(2), 73–80.
- Conforto E. C., Salum, F., Amaral, D. C., Silva, S. L., & Almeida, L. F. M. (2014). Can agile project management be adopted by industries other than software development? *Project Management Journal*, 45(3), 21–34.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed.). California: Sage Publication Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, P. V. L. (2011). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods Approaches*. California: Sage Publication Inc.
- Dinsmore, P.C. (1990). Ideas, guidelines and techniques for applying project management solutions in the general business arena: Lessons for executives. *Project Management*, 8(1), 38-33.
- Gareis R. (2006). *Happy projects*. Bucharest, Romania: ASE Press.
- Garel, G. (2013). A history of project management models: From pre-models to the standard models. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(2013), 663–669.

- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2011). SPSS for Windows: Step by step (11th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Gholami, B., & Murugesan, S. (2011). Global IT project management using web 2.0. *International Journal of Information Technology Project Management*, 2(3), 30-52.
- Goodpasture, J. C. (2011). Project management the agile way: Making it work in the enterprise. *Project Management Journal*, 42(1), 92.
- Graham, N. (2010). *PRINCE2 for dummies*. (2009th ed.). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Gunasena, R. C. (2012). Adoption of agile methods to drive software projects in non-IT based enterprises in Sri Lanka (Unpublished MBA dissertation). Retrieved from Digital library of university of Moratuwa,
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. A. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. London: Pearson Prentice Hall Ltd.
- Harrison, W. (2003). Is software engineering as we know it over the hill? *IEEE Software*, 20(3), 5–7.
- Hass, K. (2007). The blending of traditional and agile project management. Retrieved from http://cdn.projectsmart.co.uk/pdf/the-blending-of-traditional-and-agile-project-management. pdf
- Highsimith, J. (2008). *Agile project management: Creating innovation products* (2nd ed.). Delhi: Pearson.
- Hussey, J., & Hussey, R. (1997). Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Irani, Z., Al-Sebie, M., & Elliman, T. (2006). Transaction stage of e-government systems: Identification of its location & importance. In *Proceedings of the 39th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* 2006 (pp 235-242).

- Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.42 6. 5017& rep=rep 1&type= pdf
- Jayawardena, D. S., & Ekanayak, L. L. (2010). Adaptation Analysis of Agile Project Management for Managing IT projects in Sri Lanka. In *International Conference on Advances in ICT for Emerging Regions*, (pp 1-4).
- Khalifa, M., & Verner, J. M. (2000). Drivers for software development method usage. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 47(3), 360–369.
- Kuan, K. K. Y. & Chau, P. Y. K. (2001). A perception-based model for agile adoption in small businesses using a technology-organization-environment framework. *Information & Management*", 38(8), 507-521.
- Lee, O. K., Wang, M., Lim, K. H., & Peng, Z. (2009). Knowledge management systems diffusion in Chinese enterprises: A multistage approach using the technology-organization-environment framework. *Journal of Global Information Management*, 17(1), 70-84.
- Maylor, H., Vidgen, R., & Carver, S. (2008). Managerial complexity in project based operations: A grounded model and its implications for practice. *Project Management Journal*, 39, 15-26.
- McConnell, S. (2003). *Professional software development*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Mora, M. (2016). Validity and Reliability in Surveys, access through https://www.relevantinsights.com/validity-and-reliability/ on 27-12-2016.
- Morris, P. (2013). Reconstructing project management reprised: A knowledge perspective. *Project Management Journal*, 44(5), 6–23.
- Nerur, S., & Balijepally, V. G. (2007). Theoretical reflections on agile development methodologies. *Communications of the ACM*, 50(3), 79–83.
- MGC. (2013). National ICT Work Force Survey, retrieved from http://www.icta.lk/attachments/article/1247/Final%2 0Report-WFS.pdf.

- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oellgaard, M. J. (2013). The performance of a project life cycle methodology in practice. *Project Management Journal*, 44(4), 65–83.
- Oliveira, T., & Martins, M. F. (2011). Literature review of information technology adoption models at firm level. *The Electronic Journal Information Systems Evaluation*, 14(1), 110-121.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2005). Taking the "Q" out of research: Teaching research methodology courses without the divide between quantitative and qualitative paradigms. *Quality & Quantity*, 39, 267–296.
- Ormston, R., Spencer, L., Barnard, M., & Snape, D. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Washington DC: Sage Publishing.
- Panuwatwanich, K., & Peansupap, V. (2013). Factors affecting the current diffusion of BIM: A quantitative study of online professional network. In *Creative Construction Conference 2013 July 6 9, 2013*, Budapest, Hungary
- PMBOK. (2013). A guide to project management body of knowledge (5th ed.). Pennsylvania: Project Management Institute.
- Puri, C. P. (2009). *Agile management: feature driven development*. New Delhi: Global India Publications.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.) The Free Press, New York, 1995.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (3rd ed.). NY: Macmillan publishing.
- Ruël, H. J. M., Bondarouk, T., & Smink, S. (2010). The waterfall approach and requirement uncertainty: An in-depth case study of an enterprise systems implementation at a major airline company. *International Journal of Information Technology Project Management*, 1(2), 43-60.

- Sahin, I. (2006). Detailed review of Rogers' diffusion of innovations theory and educational technology-related studies based on Rogers' theory. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 5(2).
- Sauser, B. J., Reilly, R. R., & Shenhar, A. J. (2009). Why projects fail? How contingency theory can provide new insights A comparative analysis of NASA's Mars climate orbiter loss. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27(2009), 665–679.
- Schwalbe, K. (2014). *Information technology project management* (7th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Soderlund, J. (2004). Building theories of project management: past research, questions for the future. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(2004), 183–191.
- Sommerville, I., (2001). Software engineering (6th ed.). Delhi: Pearson.
- Senapathi, M., Srinivasan, A. (2012). Understanding post-adoptive agile usage: An exploratory cross-case analysis. *The Journal of Systems and Software*, 85(2012), 1255–1268.
- Senanayake, G. A. L. (2009). *The effectiveness of scrum in project management in the Sri Lankan context* (Unpublished MBA dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Library of University of Moratuwa.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. L. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modelling* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Seymour, T., & Hussein, S. (2014). The history of project management. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems*, 18(4).
- Spundaka, M. (2014). Mixed agile/traditional project management methodology Reality or illusion? *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 119, 939 948.
- Standish-Group. (1995). The chaos report. Retrieved from http://www.csus.edu/indiv/v/velianitis/161/ ChaosReport.pdf

- Stankovic, D., Nikolic, V., Djordjevic, M., & Cao, D. (2013). A survey study of critical success factors in agile software projects in former Yugoslavia IT companies. *The Journal of Systems and Software*, 86(2013), 1663–1678.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2006). A general typology of research designs featuring mixed methods. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 12-28.
- Teo, T. S. H., Ranganathan, C., & Dhaliwal, J. (2006). Key dimensions of inhibitors for the deployment of web-based business-to-business electronic commerce. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 53(3), 395-411.
- Tornatzky, L.G., & Fleischer, M. (1990). *The Processes of technological innovation*. Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Wideman, R. M. (1989). Successful project control and execution. *Project Management*, 7(2), 109-113.
- Williams, T. (2005). Assessing and moving on from the dominant project management discourse in the light of project overruns. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 52(4), 497–508.
- Williams, L., Layman, L., & Krebs, W., (2004). Extreme programming evaluation framework for object-oriented languages (1st ed.). Boston: NCSU.
- Wit, A. (1988). Measurement of project success. *Project Management*, 6(3), 164-170.
- Woolley, C. M. (2009). Meeting the mixed methods challenge of integration in a sociological study of structure and agency. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 3(1), 7-25.
- Ye, R. M. (2012). Making connections: An investigation into the factors determining internet uptake by rural residents in China. *Communication, Politics & Culture,* 45, 241-255.

### Appendix I – Survey Instrument

# Survey on Critical Factors for Adoption Agile Project Management Approach in Sri Lankan IT Firms

Agile project management is an interactive and incremental method of managing the desing and build activities for engineering, information technology, and new product or service development projects in a highly flexible and interactive manner. This research aims to investigate your perceptions of the critical factors of adopting agile project management in IT firms in Sri Lanka.

Thank you very much for agreeing to spend a few minutes of your time to complete this survey. If you have been involved with more than one agile project, please tick the most relevant with regard to critical success factors of such a project.

#### This survey contains following sections

Part I : Demographic and organizational information

Part II : Critical factors for adopting agile project management

Part III: Diffusion of innovation factors and agile project success measures

Your assistance is requested in anonymously answering the questions. Your responses will be strictly confidential. Should you have further questions with regards to the survey please feel free to contact me through email kanishkatwk@gmail.com.

## Part I- Demographic and Organizational Data

For questions 1–10 please provide some basic information regarding yourself and your organization

1.	What is your gender?
	☐ Male ☐ Female
2.	Which of these age groups are you in?
	☐ 20-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41-50 ☐ 51-60 ☐ More than 60
3.	What is your position at the organization?
	Software/Database/Network/IT engineer Team leader Project manager Program manager Portfolio manager Assistant/Deputy/General manager Chief executive officer/Managing director Other, please specify
4.	What is your highest level of education?
	<ul> <li>☐ School</li> <li>☐ Undergraduate degree</li> <li>☐ Postgraduate degree</li> <li>☐ Professional education</li> </ul>
5.	What is your training/qualification on agile project management?
	<ul> <li>No formal training/qualification</li> <li>PMI Agile certificate practitioner</li> <li>Agile project management with Scrum</li> <li>Other, please specify</li> </ul>

6.	What is your level of experience in years in agile project management?
	<u> </u>
	☐ 6-10
	More than 10 years
7.	To which category does your company belong?
	Software/Web Development
	Data Communication/Tele Communication
	Hardware
	Project Management
	Training and Service Support
	IT Consultancy
	Other, please specify
8.	What are the agile project management methods used in your organization?
	Scrum
	Kanban
	Scrum ban
	Cristal Clear
	Extreme Programming
	Other, please specify
9.	What is the size of your organization in terms of the number of people employed?
	<u> </u>
	11-25
	<u>26-50</u>
	<u> 51-100</u>
	101-500
	501-1000
	More than 1000
10.	What is your organization's annual revenue in Rs?
	Please specify Rs

### Part II – The Critical Factors for Adopting Agile Project Management

This section includes all the possible success factors for adopting agile project management approach. It seeks to find out how would think those factors are important for adopting agile project management approach within an organization. Please response to each of following statements according the following scale.

	3 =	= Somewhat not important, $2 = Not$ important	rtant,	1 = N	ot imp	ortan	it at al	!!	
11		nat extent do you think that following <u>proing</u> agile project management?  [Tick ( $$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Hig$							
		[Tick (v) on the scale below. 7 – The	ζπιγ ι	mporu	инг	1	- 1 <b>vo</b> i	-	ıt all
	11a	Set up a vision for the product,	<i>7</i> □	<b>6</b>	<i>5</i> □	<b>4</b>	<i>3</i> □	<b>2</b> □	
	11b 11c	customer, and team Feature based release, and iterations Test features in a short timeframe							
	11d	Review delivered results, current situation, and team performance							
	11e	Passing along key lessons to other projects							
12		hat extent do you think that following to ing agile project management?  [Tick ( $\sqrt{\ }$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Highlar at all$ ]							
	12a	Use agile project management methodologies (eg. Scrum, Kanban, XP)	<i>7</i> □	<i>6</i> □	<i>5</i> □	4	3	2	
	12b	Use of software packages (eg. VersionOne, RallyDev)							
	12c	Use burn down charts to measure performance							
	12d 12e	Maintain product and sprint backlogs Use agile software development methodologies							
13		nat extent do you think that following <u>proc</u> tant in adopting agile project managemen		neasuı	<u>remen</u>	t read	iness :	factor	rs are
	1	[Tick ( $$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Highlorian at all]$		portan	t	. 1 =	Not in	nport	ant
			7	6	5	4	3	2	1
	13a	Product has a clear vision							
	13b	Product has clearly defined objectives							
	13c	Product has clearly defined measurable outcomes							

7 = Very important, 6 = Important, 5 = Somewhat important, 4 = Neutral, unsuccessful,

		[11ck (1) on the scale below. 7 – 11tg)	niy im <sub>l</sub>	portan	<i>u</i>	I =	NOT I	•	tant t all
		[Tick ( $\sqrt{\ }$ ) on the scale below: $7 = High$	1.1			1	<b>N</b> T - 4		
16		nat extent do you think that following <u>tea</u> ng agile project management approach?	m rea	<u>diness</u>	facto	ors are	e imp	ortant	for
	- 0	decision making	, <u> </u>				J		
	15g	team  Management encouraging participatory	у П						
	15f	outside norms Management's willingness to empower	r 🔲						
	15e	Management motivating team to work							
	15d	Management's willingness to take risk to promote innovation	) [						
		leadership-collaborative managemen style	t						
	15b 15c	Top executives' commitment Managers' willingness to implement a	a 📙						
		project management							
	15a	Managers' sound knowledge in agile	<i>7</i> □	<b>6</b>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i> □	<b>2</b> □	<i>1</i>
		[Tick ( $\sqrt{\ }$ ) on the scale below: $7 = High$	hly imp	portan	ıt	1 =	Not i	_	tant all]
15		hat extent do you think that following tant in adopting agile project management		ageme	ent re	<u>adine</u>	e <u>ss</u> ar	e fac	ctors
	14g	A rewarding system for agile achievers							
	14f	*							
	14e	Culture that encourages experiment and exploration							
	14d	Flexible and adaptive organizational culture							
	14c	Oral culture placing high value on face- to-face communication			Ш		Ш		
	14b	organizational environment Clearly defined roles for staff							
	14a	Supportive and cooperative	<i>7</i> □	<b>6</b> □	<i>5</i> □	<b>4</b>	$\Box$	$\Box$	
		[Tick ( $\sqrt{\ }$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Hight$	у ітро	ortant		I = I	Vot in	iporto	all
	ractor	s are important in adopting agile project m	ianage	ment.					

To what extent do you think that following organizational and cultural readiness

16a	Right team mates with motivation and right competency							
16b	Every individual understands the product vision, and team vision							
16c	Project manager leads the team rather than control							
16d	Individuals take responsibility for managing the workload among themselves							
16e	Maintain healthier relationships with customers							
16f	Team participation in decision making							
16g	Team's accountability for the results produced							
16h	Trust and respect of team members ideas							
import	ant for adopting agile project management	!						
import			ortan	ı <i>t</i>	1 —	Not	imnoi	tant.
-	[Tick ( $$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Highl$		ortan	5	1 =	Not 1	-	rtant et all
import			ortan <b>6</b>	5 <u> </u>	1 = <b>4</b>	<i>Not</i> 1	-	t all
-	[Tick ( $$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Highl$ ]  Rapidly changing business needs increase the need of using agile project management  Pressure from customers to deliver the product faster create the need for using		ortan 6	5	1 = <b>4</b>	Not a 3 □	-	t all
17a	[Tick (\sqrt) on the scale below: 7 = Highly Rapidly changing business needs increase the need of using agile project management Pressure from customers to deliver the product faster create the need for using agile project management Heavy use of agile project management by the competitors create the need for		6	5	1 = <b>4</b>	3	-	t all
17a 17b	[Tick (\sqrt) on the scale below: 7 = Highly Rapidly changing business needs increase the need of using agile project management Pressure from customers to deliver the product faster create the need for using agile project management Heavy use of agile project management		6	5	1 = 4	Not i	-	t all

## **Part III – The Diffusion of Innovation Factors**

18		at extent do you think using agile project naditional project management approaches s	_			_			ages
	[Tich	$k(\sqrt{)}$ on the scale below: $7 = Highly$ imposing	rtant. <b>7</b>	6	1 = 1 <b>5</b>	Vot in <b>4</b>	iporto <b>3</b>	ant at <b>2</b>	all] <b>1</b>
	18a	Using agile project management increases customer satisfaction							
	18b	Agile project management is flexible							
	18c	No need to draw up a detailed project plan upfront							
	18d	Less documentations work							
	18e	No overtime - honouring regular work schedule							
	18f	Early identification of risk due to iterative development							
	18g	Self-disciplined teams rather than imposed discipline							
	18h	Empowered teams							
19	the exis	at extent do you think is agile project mana sting values and practices? $(x ())$ on the scale below: $y = 0$	_		-		_		
	_		7	6	5	4	3	2	1
	19a	Existing organizational structure welcomes agile practices.							
	19b	Existing organizational culture welcomes agile practices							
	19c	Facilitate the organizational effort to the							
	19d	development of customer relationships improvement of individuals' relationships within the organization							
20	Ham d		:1	-i4					<b>L</b> 0
20		o you think about the <u>complexity</u> of the ag	_	_		_		_	
	[Tic	$ck\ (\forall)$ on the scale below: $7 = Highly$ imposes	_		_		_	_	-
	20a	Agile project management approach is easy to implement within the	7	<i>6</i> □	5	4	3	$\Box$	
	20c	organization Agile project management is a flexible							
	20d	approach Adequate support is available for agile methods within the environment							

	20e	Training materials and resources ar available to gain knowledge about agil project management.								
21	How o	do you think about the observability of the					_			
		[Tick ( $$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Hig$	hly	valı	ıable		I = I	Vot va	ıluabi	le at all]
				7	6	5	4	3	2	<i>1</i>
	21a	Increased customer satisfaction i evident after using agile approach	.S							
	21b	0 0 11	.S							
	21c	Success rate of the projects are very high after using agile project management								
	21d	approach  Quality of the products are higher								
	21e	Products are innovative and adaptable		Ħ	Ħ	H	H	H	H	H
	21f	Time and cost are saved as a result agile project management approach	e							
22		measures should be used to access the suc t management approach?	cces	ss of	proj	ect ma	anage	d thro	ugh a	igile
	/	Tick ( $\sqrt{\ }$ ) on the scale below: $7 = Highly$	val	uabl	'e	1 =	Not	valua	ble at	all]
	L	( )	7		6	5	4	3	2	1
	22a	Successfully achieving financial targets								
	22b	Successfully achieving time targets	Г	٦						
	22c	Successfully achieving quality targets	Ė	Ť	П	П	П	П	П	П
	22d	Successfully achieving project scope		Ī						
	22e	Successfully delivering desired customer value through innovative products								
	22f	Successfully delivering desired customer value through adaptable products which not just satisfy today's needs but also future needs								

# Appendix II – K-S Test Results

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>						
Factor	Statistic	df	Sig.				
Process Readiness	.350	158	.000				
Process Readiness	.313	158	.000				
Process Readiness	.327	158	.000				
Process Readiness	.315	158	.000				
Process Readiness	.226	158	.000				
Tools Readiness	.307	158	.000				
Tools Readiness	.263	158	.000				
Tools Readiness	.234	158	.000				
Tools Readiness	.226	158	.000				
Tools Readiness	.327	158	.000				
Measurement Readiness	.251	158	.000				
Measurement Readiness	.259	158	.000				
Measurement Readiness	.219	158	.000				
Org And Cultural Readiness	.233	158	.000				
Org And Cultural Readiness	.284	158	.000				
Org And Cultural Readiness	.284	158	.000				
Org And Cultural Readiness	.231	158	.000				
Org And Cultural Readiness	.238	158	.000				
Org And Cultural Readiness	.296	158	.000				
Org And Cultural Readiness	.227	158	.000				
Management Readiness	.375	158	.000				
Management Readiness	.259	158	.000				
Management Readiness	.234	158	.000				
Management Readiness	.265	158	.000				
Management Readiness	.272	158	.000				
Management Readiness	.270	158	.000				
Management Readiness	.285	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.265	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.259	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.317	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.283	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.235	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.269	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.259	158	.000				
Team Readiness	.330	158	.000				
Environment Readiness	.320	158	.000				

Environment Readiness	.333	158	.000
Environment Readiness	.220	158	.000
Environment Readiness	.223	158	.000
Environment Readiness	.256	158	.000
Usefullness	.319	158	.000
Usefullness	.322	158	.000
Usefullness	.231	158	.000
Usefullness	.193	158	.000
Usefullness	.189	158	.000
Usefullness	.320	158	.000
Usefullness	.271	158	.000
Usefullness	.285	158	.000
Values And Practices	.262	158	.000
Values And Practices	.251	158	.000
Values And Practices	.258	158	.000
Values And Practices	.286	158	.000
Complexity	.263	158	.000
Complexity	.266	158	.000
Complexity	.298	158	.000
Complexity	.316	158	.000
Observability	.259	158	.000
Observability	.297	158	.000
Observability	.255	158	.000
Observability	.276	158	.000
Observability	.267	158	.000
Observability	.228	158	.000
Success	.342	158	.000
Success	.287	158	.000
Success	.255	158	.000
Success	.220	158	.000
Success	.228	158	.000
Success	.229	158	.000