

THE RIPHAH INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, LAHORE

INSTITUTE OF COMPUTING

Project Management	
Name	Shahbaz Akhtar Javed
Program	MSCS 4 th
SAP ID	30330
Submitted To	Dr. Muhammad Yaseen



Do Agile Managed Information Systems Projects Fail Due to a Lack of Emotional Intelligence?

Context:

Since the introduction of Agile Development Methodology (ADM), organizations have been fascinated by the ability to engage stakeholders, adapt to changing needs, and deliver software faster. ADM makes processes simple and easy while putting human effort and knowledge at the core through a strong focus on people and relationships. Realizing the importance of people's motivation, researchers have made many efforts to investigate social issues facing active organizations. They reported problems with recruitment, training, motivation and performance appraisal or effective communication, cooperation and motivation. However, if human aspects are neglected, there is a risk that the results will not reflect the important factors that determine the success or failure of software projects. The structure associated with these problems is revealed and emotional intelligence (EI) is neglected. Ideas grow out of social interaction and are therefore the main reason for how we communicate and work together.

Problem:

Agile development methods (ADM) are widely used in information systems (IS) project management. However, with its increasing popularity, the human-related challenges in implementing ADM are rapidly increasing in concern. However, the existing scientific literature has neglected to identify the root causes of these challenges. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to quantitatively examine whether these human-related challenges are associated with a lack of emotional intelligence (EI).

Objectives:

From a sample of 194 agile practitioners, Emotional Intelligence was found to be significantly correlated to human related challenges in agile teams in terms of anxiety, motivation, mutual trust and communication competence.

Methodology:

1. Indicating Causal Inference

Most important tune in social sciences is “correlation does not imply causation” if we change one variable then other variable is also changed. So we need find that is any other relationship is not present between it. The foolproof to ensure aberration need to use different experiments, because single assign to use different experiments. At the base line all the characteristics are same.

2. Propensity Score Matching

Frame for quasi-experimentation developed by Rabin in 1974. Rubin Casual Model also known as RCM is a model with a compact and precise conceptualization of casual inference which includes three elements.

- Units
- Treatments
- Potential Outcomes

3. Data Collection, Ethical Considerations, Sample and Measures

Data collection start on 13 july 2018 and it is conducted for eleven weeks. Participation was anonymous, voluntary and without any compensation. The participants were also informed about the purpose of this research, that they are free to withdraw at any time and that everything they report is confidential.

Data analysis

All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 24 and IBM AMOS 25. There was no missing data.

Scale	Dimension	Mean	S.D.	Cronbach-alpha
-------	-----------	------	------	----------------

HRACI	Anxiety	2.881	1.236	0.776
HRACI	Motivation	2.708	1.07	0.836
HRACI	Communication	2.18	1.042	0.875
HRACI	Mutual Trust	2.581	1.059	0.720
WLEIS	Appraisal and expression of emotion in oneself	3.919	0.864	0.818
WLEIS	Appraisal and recognition of emotion hi other	3.773	0.894	0.848
WLEIS	Use of emotion to facilitate performance	3.995	0.871	0.749
WLEIS	Regulation of emotion in oneself	3.657	0.973	0.857

Results:

The purpose of this research was to examine if a lack of EI has a negative impact on perceived human related challenges in agile teams within the dimensions of anxiety, motivation, communication competence and mutual trust. Data analyses revealed ten significant negative associations.

Future Work

This research has some limitations that needs to be taken into account.

First, both HRACI, as well as WLEIS are self-report measures and therefore are prone to self-enhancement and socially desirable responses. Hence, scholars have raised concerns, if EI assessed by self- report measures, actually measures an actual ability rather than a trait.

Second, the continuous treatment variable EI has been dichotomized. Although, methods such as the Generalized Propensity Score exist, diagnostics are complicated for these methods, as it becomes more complex to assess the balance of the covariates.

Third, the authors acknowledge that the sample only includes IS-professionals and thus limits the generalizability of the research findings.