

Eximia journal

www.eximiajournal.ro

Vol. 14/2025

PLUS
COMMUNICATION P



International
Communication & PR

Transformation in Strategic Management Approaches: From Linear Planning to Agile and Digital Approaches

Seyyed Sina Ahrar

Master of Science, Department of Management, Faculty of Economy and Management, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran

ssinaahrar@outlook.com

Abstract. This review article explores the shift in strategic management from traditional linear planning models to increasingly prevalent agile and digital methodologies driven by rapid technological advancements, globalization, and growing business complexity. The study synthesizes current literature on the use of agile approaches in many industries, emphasizing how these approaches promote adaptability in strategic management. The primary analysis focuses on juxtaposing traditional, linear, and agile approaches in strategic management, utilizing case studies and expert insights to elucidate the advantages and challenges. However, the review also recognizes possible limitations, including the details involved in transitioning to agile systems and the scalability of this methodology within large organizations. Through a detailed analysis of these challenges, we offer insights into effective implementation strategies and best practices for successful transformation. The paper concludes by discussing the future trajectory of strategic management in a digital-first world, emphasizing the paramount importance of adaptability, and the continuous evolution of agile and digital approaches to maintain a competitive edge.

Keywords. Strategic Management, Linear Planning, Agile Approaches, Globalization

Introduction:

The evolution of strategic management approaches has undergone significant transformation, particularly in response to changing business environments and technological advancements. Therefore, over the past few decades, strategic management has rapidly changed from rigid structures of traditional linear planning to more dynamic approaches. This change is due, first and foremost, to rapid technological changes, globalization, and growing complexity in business. The traditional linear strategic planning model, which is usually characterized by long-term forecasting followed by implementation, is no longer able to cope with the uncertainty that pervades the modern business landscape (Savignon, 2024). The other limitation of this strategic planning lies in the fact that it expects incremental big-scale changes in a static environment, which renders it incompetent to handle unexpected events and/or huge windows of opportunity (Savignon, 2024). Moreover, its emphasis on detail and long-term planning makes it inflexible and incapable of reacting to changing circumstances (Druhova, n.d.). On the other hand, agile and digital methodologies, vary from traditional linear planning. This approach is built on a segmented structure, with each section presenting a planning cycle, in

contrast to traditional linear planning, which develops upon a master plan. This method maintains aspects of planning inside those cycles (Prange, C., & Hennig, A., 2019). As a result, agile approaches permit planning without the inflexibility of conventional linear planning. Moreover, adaptable agile and digital methodologies, focus on incremental delivery and encourage feedback loops, those traditional approaches render a corporation more responsive to its dynamic environment (Revutska, 2022). In addition, the integration of new digital technologies has increased the ability of organizations to plan and monitor the different facets of their strategies process opening up further avenues for innovation and efficiency upgrading (Gloria, 2024).

This review will investigate the theoretical basis of agile and digital strategic management, through established frameworks and models. It will discuss the leadership that flourishes in the transformation process (Chandratreya, 2024), including the encouragement of an innovation-oriented and collaborative spirit in the organization (Adegbite, 2023). A comparative analysis between different approaches and the pros and cons would be done, specifying the contexts for which each approach would be most suited. There will likewise be a discussion of the difficulties in the implementation of these approaches by organizations, with particular attention paid to certain issues that arise, such as data security, Inadequate skills, and resistance to change (Gloria, 2024), and how those changes will permeate into and impact various aspects of organizational performance, like cost reduction, customer experience, and competitive positioning will also be assessed (Gloria, 2024).

2. Literature Review:

2.1. The Emergence of Agile Methodologies

The development and adaptation of agile methodologies are driven by the limitations of traditional linear planning which are adaptive, vibrant, flexible, and fast, due to creativity, team communication, and exploration of projects allowing for quick changes in response to new risks or changes in project requirements. Numerous case studies demonstrate that agile methodologies are often well-suited to various projects, with their applicability depending on the specific type of agile approach employed. Since agile methodologies rely heavily on direct communication among team members, they are particularly well-suited for smaller teams where communication is more manageable (N. Keshta and Y. Morgan, 2017). The agile team operates in a self-organizing manner, taking responsibility for their planning and determining their trajectory throughout the project. Furthermore, contemporary projects encounter various unforeseen challenges during their lifecycle, making the inherent adaptability of agile methodologies advantageous for effective management. Additionally, it is posited that agile methodologies are person-centered, signifying that individuals—including customers, stakeholders, developers, team members, and end-users—constitute a pivotal success factor within the project development lifecycle.

2.2. Agile Methodology Limitations and Challenges

As mentioned above, agility treats people as first-order project success; they have a strong belief in a people-oriented approach in contrast to a process-oriented approach. While agile methods have many benefits, there are potential limitations, such as difficulty in scaling and lack of predictability (S. W. Ambler, 2008). on the other hand, a study done in 2016 (A. Elbanna and S. Sarker, 2016) recommended that while agile methods can effectively manage risks, they lack clarity and cultural transformation. Also, Cockburn and Highsmith, emphasized that the biggest limitation of agile methodologies is the handling of a large team due to

coordinating interfaces becoming a dominant issue during size growth. However face-to-face communication in agile methodologies breaks down and becomes more difficult and complex with developers of more than 20 whereas the traditional linear methods scale better to large projects (L. Constantine, 2001).

2.3. Traditional Linear Planning: Strengths and Limitations

In contrast to agile methodologies, traditional linear approaches have existed for an extended period and provide enhanced structure and oversight in the project management process, rendering them superior in terms of planning and forecasting potential risks in advance. These methods are favored for larger teams due to their effective organization and documentation, whereas agile practices may struggle with larger team sizes due to ineffective communication and a decline in individual productivity. This methodology typically emphasizes initial comprehensive planning for substantial portions of the process in meticulous detail over an extended timeframe, thereby exemplifying its future-oriented nature. However, while the strategy to meticulously plan and subsequently adhere to that plan functions seamlessly in less complex environments, it tends to disintegrate in larger and more intricate contexts, highlighting one of the approach's limitations in managing complexity (M. Fowler, 2004). As W. Cunningham articulated, "It's easier to add something to a process that's too simple than it is to take something away from a process that's too complicated" (W. Cunningham, 2004). Another limitation inherent in this approach is its inflexibility, which adheres to strict hierarchies and predetermined processes, resulting in a sluggish response to change or even an aversion to it (L. Williams and A. Cockburn, 2003). Furthermore, rather than ensuring that outcomes are congruent with overarching objectives, the predominant aim often centers on the maintenance of control and operational efficiency.

2.4. Agile, and Digital Transformation and its Impact on Strategic Management

In the literature, shifting an organization from less to more agile is referred to as "agile transformation" or "agile transition". Agile and Digital Transformation have significantly influenced strategic management, indicating a period characterized by data-driven decision-making and unmatched innovation prospects, thereby attracting organizations' attention across diverse sectors globally. Comprehending this movement is an exceptionally pertinent strategic initiative within the intensely competitive economic milieu (Diogo et al., 2019). The assimilation of digital technologies, including artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, and the Internet of Things (IoT), has fundamentally transformed how organizations formulate and assess their strategies (Gloria, 2024). Utilizing data analytics for predictive modeling empowers organizations to foresee emerging trends and proactively recalibrate their strategies as necessary (Choori, A. & Kazemi, S. (NaN)). Consequently, this process aspires to enhance organizational capabilities, instigating substantial alterations in their attributes through the integration of information, communication, and connectivity technologies (Vial, G., 2019), thereby facilitating notable business advancements, such as improved customer experiences and optimized operations. Digital transformation is a multifaceted phenomenon, and it holds greater significance for enterprises functioning in dynamic and competitive markets, so it represents a strategic response to economic shifts and digital technology advancements; thus, in confronting the challenges posed by digital transformation and the imperative to maintain competitiveness within their industries, consequently it needs corporate leaders division and implement strategies that encompass the ramifications of digital transformation and foster enhanced operational performance (Hess et al., 2016).

2.5. Challenges in Implementing Agile and Digital Strategies

While the implementation of agile and digital methodologies presents substantial benefits, organizations may encounter significant obstacles during the transformation process due to various factors, including the necessity for time and effort (Gandomani and Nafchi, 2015), as well as financial implications (Gloria, 2024). Additionally, the magnitude and intricacy of projects within large organizations engender numerous interdependencies, necessitating a considerable degree of coordination. Given that agile principles are founded on self-organization, individuals involved in extensive projects often struggle to facilitate mutual adjustment coordination on a broad scale (Barlow et al., 2011), which may further aggravate communication difficulties. Furthermore, addressing cultural resistance to change is another vital aspect in the successful implementation of agile practices; individuals accustomed to traditional hierarchical frameworks and linear workflows may exhibit resistance to the inherently collaborative and iterative essence of agile methodologies (Gloria, 2024). Conversely, the challenges stemming from the shared decision-making process inherent in agile practices are noteworthy; for instance, agile software development necessitates the alignment of decisions across strategic, tactical, and operational dimensions to navigate these challenges effectively. This transition also demands a shift from specialized competencies to functional redundancy, as well as from rational to naturalistic decision-making approaches (Moe et al., 2012). Decision-making difficulties may result in impediments such as a lack of long-term strategic focus in decision processes, an accumulating backlog of postponed tasks from prior iterations, and diminished team engagement (Drury et al., 2012). Additionally, data security concerns represent another critical issue that necessitates meticulous attention to data privacy and protection protocols throughout the digital transformation journey (Gloria, 2024).

2.6. Comparison of Agile vs. Traditional Approaches

The agile and traditional linear methodologies exhibit distinct advantages and disadvantages. The selection of the appropriate methodology hinges on several critical factors, particularly their alignment with varying circumstances. The first factor pertains to team size, influenced by project duration, budget constraints, and organizational structure; traditional linear methodologies are generally favored for larger teams (with an optimal agile team size ranging from 15 to 25 members, while traditional methodologies are more effective with teams of 25 or more) due to their facilitation of organization, planning, documentation, and enhanced communication processes. Conversely, agile methodologies may encounter challenges in larger teams, as they often result in ineffective communication and diminished individual productivity (P. Lohnes, 2016). Nevertheless, agile methods may prove more suitable for projects of this nature due to their iterative approach, adaptability to changing requirements, and emphasis on incremental releases. However, an increase in team size correlates with heightened communication demands and reduced productivity, necessitating the inclusion of additional team members. Traditional methodologies often involve considerable "time waste" outputs, such as documentation, design schematics, and analytical writing. Hence, it is concluded that in scenarios with constrained timelines, agile methodologies offer superior efficacy. Agile models are inherently designed for iterative development, whereas traditional methodologies adhere to a sequential development framework that is typically recognized as conventional. Furthermore, the quality of requirements in agile methodologies is given paramount importance, as it significantly impacts the overall quality of the final developmental solution. Traditional methodologies also emphasize the necessity of documented requirements, albeit with less granularity. In the realms of planning and monitoring development activities, agile

methodologies generate task lists at the outset of the development process, which are persistently maintained throughout the project, whereas traditional methodologies employ Gantt charts that initially outline all project activities. Ultimately, each methodology possesses the capacity to address specific challenges per project requirements. Consequently, should an organization opt to endorse only one methodology, it must restrict its project acceptance to align with the selected methodology. Nevertheless, traditional and agile methods do not inherently conflict, allowing for coexistence within a single organization.

<i>Approach</i>	<i>Agile Approach</i>	<i>Traditional Linear Approach</i>
Methodology	Iterative and incremental	Sequential (Waterfall model)
Size	Smaller teams and projects	Larger teams and projects
Flexibility	Highly adaptable to changes	Limited flexibility once planning is done
Planning	Continuous, adaptive planning, and qualitative control	Comprehensive upfront planning, and quantitative control
Team Collaboration	Emphasizes collaboration and self-organizing teams	Follows hierarchical structure
Cost of Start	Low	High
Customer Involvement	High; ongoing feedback from stakeholders	Low; customer involvement mainly at the start and end
Documentation	Focus on working software over documentation	Extensive documentation required
Timeframe	Continuous delivery with no fixed end date	Fixed timeline defined upfront
Primary objective	Quick Value	High safety
Best Suited For	Dynamic, fast-changing environments	Well-defined, stable requirements

Table a: Agile and Traditional Linear Approaches Comparison

3. Conclusion

The shift from traditional linear planning to agile and digital methodologies in strategic management has transcended mere preference, evolving into an imperative for organizational survival and prosperity. The constraints of traditional, inflexible planning frameworks amid rapid technological progress and fluctuating market dynamics are irrefutable. Agile methodologies, characterized by their focus on iterative development, collaboration, and adaptability, provide a more effective paradigm for addressing change and promoting innovation. The incorporation of digital technologies further amplifies strategic management capabilities, facilitating data-informed decision-making, enhanced operational efficiency, and improved customer engagement. Although this transition poses considerable challenges, such as the integration of legacy systems, skill deficiencies, and cultural resistance, organizations that proactively confront these obstacles and cultivate a culture of continuous learning and

innovation will be optimally positioned for enduring success in the digital era. The future of strategic management is predicated on the acceptance of change, the promotion of adaptability, and the utilization of agile and digital methodologies to navigate the intricacies of the contemporary business landscape. By amalgamating these two paradigms, the research posits that project managers can harness the advantages inherent in both approaches, culminating in a more holistic strategy for risk management within projects. Ultimately, the study underscores that while agile methodologies adeptly manage risks, they may also induce unpredictability and resistance to change. Conversely, traditional methodologies may result in inflexibility and challenges in accommodating changes. By integrating both approaches, project managers can achieve a harmonious balance between flexibility and control, thereby enhancing the overall risk management process.

References:

1. Savignon, A. B. & Costumato, L. (2024). Project management logics for agile public strategic management: propositions from the literature and a research agenda. None. <https://doi.org/10.3233/ip-230061>
2. Druhova, O., Mosumova, A., Dai, B., & Tong, Q. (NaN). Competitiveness is a key factor in successful strategic business management. Business Inform. <https://doi.org/10.32983/2222-4459-2024-8-439-445>
3. Prange, C., & Hennig, A. (2019). From Strategic Planning to Strategic Agility Patterns. Journal of Creating Value, 5(2), 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394964319867778>
4. Revutska, O. & Antlov, K. (2022). Application of agile management approaches in selected automotive companies in liberec and central bohemian regions. None. <https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2022-3-011>
5. Gloria, O., Eyieyien,, Eyieyien, O. G., Paul, P. O., & Ijomah, T. (2024). Strategic approaches for successful digital transformation in project management across industries. International Journal of Frontiers in Engineering and Technology Research. <https://doi.org/10.53294/ijfetr.2024.7.1.0037>
6. Chandratreya, D. A. (2024). Digital transformation strategy and management. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT. <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsrem38058>
7. Adegbite, A. O., Adefemi, A., Ukpoju, E. A., Abatan, A., Adekoya, O. O., & Obaedo, B. O. (2023). Innovations in project management: trends and best practices. Fair East Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.51594/estj.v4i6.670>
8. Prange, C., & Hennig, A. (2019). From Strategic Planning to Strategic Agility Patterns. Journal of Creating Value, 5(2), 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394964319867778>
9. N. Keshta and Y. Morgan, "Comparison between traditional plan-based and agile software processes according to team size & project domain (A systematic literature review)," 2017 8th IEEE Annual Information Technology, Electronics and Mobile Communication Conference (IEMCON), Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2017, pp. 567-575, doi: 10.1109/IEMCON.2017.8117128
10. S. W. Ambler, "Has Agile Peaked?", *Dr Dobbs J.*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 52, 2008.
11. A. Elbanna and S. Sarker, "The Risks of Agile Software Development: Learning from Adopters", *IEEE Softw.*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 72-79, 2016.
12. J. Highsmith and A. Cockburn, "Agile Software Development: The People Factor", *IEEE Computer*, <http://www.jimhighsmith.com/articles/IEEEArticle2Final.pdf> Accessed on 10/10/20054

13. L. Constantine, "Methodological Agility," *IEEE Software Development*, June 2001, pp.67-69
14. M. Fowler, "The New Methodology," <http://www.martinfowler.com/articles/newMethodology.html> Accessed on 12/12/2004
15. W. Cunningham, "Agile Manifesto." <http://www.agilemanifesto.org/>, Accessed on 10/7/2004
16. L. Williams and A. Cockburn, "Agile Software Development: It's about Feedback and Change," *IEEE Computer*, June 2003, pp. 39-43
17. Diogo, R. A., Junior A. K., & Santos N. (2019). A Transformação Digital e a Gestão do Conhecimento: contribuições para a melhoria dos processos produtivos e organizacionais. *P2P & Inovação*, 5(2), 154–175.
18. Gloria, O., Eyieyien,, Eyieyien, O. G., Paul, P. O., & Ijomah, T. (2024). Strategic approaches for successful digital transformation in project management across industries. *International Journal of Frontiers in Engineering and Technology Research*. <https://doi.org/10.53294/ijfetr.2024.7.1.0037>
19. Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118–144.
20. Choori, A. & Kazemi, S. (NaN). Strategic management in the digital age: a review of decision-making frameworks. None. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.ijimob.3.2.4>
21. Hess, T., Matt, C., Benlian, A., & Wiesboeck, F. (2016). Options for formulating a digital transformation strategy. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 15(2), 123–139.
22. Gandomani, T.J. and Nafchi, M.Z. (2015), "An empirically-developed framework for Agile transition and adoption: a Grounded Theory approach", *Journal of Systems and Software*, Vol. 107, pp. 204-219, doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2015.06.006.
23. Barlow, J.B., Giboney, J., Keith, M.J., Wilson, D., Schuetzler, R.M., Lowry, P.B. and Vance, A. (2011), "Overview and guidance on agile development in large organizations", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 25-44, doi: 10.17705/1cais.02902.
24. Drury, M., Conboy, K. and Power, K. (2012), "Obstacles to decision making in Agile software development teams", *Journal of Systems and Software*, Vol. 85 No. 6, pp. 1239-1254, doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2012.01.058.
25. Moe, N.B., Aurum, A. and Dybå, T. (2012), "Challenges of shared decision-making: a multiple case study of agile software development", *Information and Software Technology*, Vol. 54 No. 8, pp. 853-865, doi: 10.1016/j.infsof.2011.11.006.
26. P. Lohnes, Comparisons of Agile vs. Traditional Approaches, 2016, [online] Available: <http://blogs.managementconcepts.com/comparisons-of-agile-vs-traditional-approaches/#.WJ-6ZIWcHVK>.