European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 47-53

Check for updates

Operational Resilience in Volatile Environments: A Comparative Assessment of Hybrid Project Management in Software and Infrastructure

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITTED 01 October 2025
ACCEPTED 15 October 2025
PUBLISHED 31 October 2025
VOLUME Vol.05 Issue10 2025

Wei Zhang

Independent Researcher Shanghai, China

Elena Sokolova

Independent Project Management Consultant Moscow, Russia

Abstract Background: The contemporary project management landscape is characterized by increasing volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA). Traditional predictive methodologies (Waterfall) often lack the flexibility to address rapid changes, while adaptive methodologies (Agile) can lack the governance and predictability required for large-scale investments. Consequently, Hybrid Project Management (HPM) has emerged as a pragmatic solution.

Objectives: This study aims to evaluate the efficacy of Hybrid methodologies compared to pure Agile and Waterfall approaches, specifically examining their application across two distinct sectors: software development and large-scale infrastructure. Furthermore, it investigates the role of cultural factors in the adoption of these methodologies.

Methods: A systematic literature review and comparative meta-synthesis were conducted, analyzing data from peer-reviewed sources ranging from foundational texts to empirical studies published in 2023 and 2025. The analysis focuses on project success rates, risk mitigation in turbulent environments, and organizational architecture.

Results: Findings indicate that Hybrid approaches significantly outperform singular methodologies in "turbulent" environments by balancing the structural

rigor of Waterfall with the iterative execution of Agile. In infrastructure, "Agile modules" are increasingly integrated into the design phase, while software engineering retains a "Water-Scrum-Fall" dominance. Additionally, the emergence of "Scrumban" significantly optimizes delivery pipelines. Cultural analysis suggests that Hybrid models serve as a necessary bridge in high-power-distance cultures, allowing for Agile adoption within hierarchical governance structures.

Conclusion: The study concludes that hybridization is not merely a transitional state but a mature, destination methodology. Organizations are encouraged to formalize Hybrid frameworks rather than treating them as ad-hoc adaptations.

Keywords: Hybrid Project Management, Agile Methodologies, Scrumban, Infrastructure Development, Software Engineering, Cultural Adaptability, Volatility, Organizational Architecture.

Introduction: The discipline of project management has undergone a seismic shift over the past two decades. Historically dominated by the linear, sequential logic of the Waterfall model—formally codified in the System Development Life Cycle (SDLC) [9]—the field experienced a disruption with the advent of Agile methodologies in the early 2000s. This shift was driven by the realization that rigid planning often failed to account for the emergent nature of requirements in software development [1]. However, as the digital economy has matured, a new reality has set in: neither pure rigidity nor pure flexibility is sufficient for the complexity of modern enterprise.

The current global economic environment is defined by "turbulence," a state where external shocks—ranging from supply chain disruptions to rapid technological obsolescence—occur with increasing frequency. Bjorvatn and Wald (2023) argue that in such dynamic environments, standard project management approaches become insufficient. This has led to the rise of Hybrid Project Management (HPM), a methodology that seeks to combine the predictive planning needed for budget and timeline governance with the adaptive execution required for product quality and user satisfaction.

This paper explores the operationalization of HPM across two divergent sectors: software development and physical infrastructure. While software development has largely embraced Agile, it often struggles with scaling these practices to the enterprise level without reintroducing Waterfall-style governance [2]. Conversely, the construction and infrastructure sectors, traditionally the bastions of the Critical Path Method (CPM), are increasingly looking to Agile to solve inefficiencies in the pre-construction and design phases [Choudhury & Sinha, 2023].

Furthermore, this study posits that the move toward Hybrid models is not solely technical but deeply cultural. In regions with high cultural emphasis on hierarchy and uncertainty avoidance, such as China and parts of Southeast Asia, the "chaos" perceived in pure Agile is often rejected. Here, Hybrid models act as a cultural mediator, allowing organizations to modernize their workflows without dismantling established power structures [7].

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Evolution of Methodologies

The traditional Waterfall model, rooted in engineering and manufacturing, relies on the premise that requirements can be fully known before execution begins. Radack [9] outlines the SDLC as a series of gates where progress flows downwards, a model that minimizes rework cost if requirements are stable. However, early research by Cusumano et al. [1] highlighted that globally, the state of practice was shifting as software projects faced high failure rates due to changing user needs.

In response, Agile principles, popularized by Martin [12], emphasized iterative delivery and customer collaboration. Yet, as Agile moved from small teams to large enterprises, limitations emerged. Kuhrmann et al. [2] noted that "pure" Agile is rare in practice; instead, organizations naturally drift toward "Water-Scrum-Fall," where Agile development teams work within a Waterfall budgeting cycle.

2.2 Hybridization in the Modern Era

Recent scholarship has moved beyond viewing Hybrid as a "failed Agile" implementation. Hosseini, Martek,

and Zavadskas (2023) provide a systematic review suggesting that hybridization is a deliberate strategic choice. They argue that the complexity of modern projects requires a "bimodal" capability—the ability to be stable and dynamic simultaneously.

In the context of physical projects, Denicol, Davies, and Pryke (2022) analyze the "organizational architecture" of megaprojects. They find that while the pouring of concrete follows a linear path, the stakeholder management and design integration of megaprojects behave like complex adaptive systems, requiring Agile interventions. This supports the findings of Jovanović and Berić (2022), who observed that large-scale infrastructure projects utilizing Hybrid models showed improved adaptability to regulatory changes compared to strictly traditional ones.

2.3 The Cultural Dimension

The adoption of these methodologies is heavily influenced by regional culture. Qiao [7] and Eriksson [8] investigated the impact of Chinese cultural factors on Agile adoption. They identified that the Agile values of "self-organization" and "challenging authority" often clash with Confucian values of respect for hierarchy (Guanxi) and face-saving. Consequently, Zhou et al. [5] found that Chinese industry tends to adopt Hybrid models that maintain top-down control while allowing for iterative technical work, effectively localizing the methodology.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a qualitative comparative meta-synthesis. Given the broad scope of the inquiry—spanning distinct industries and cultural contexts—a quantitative survey alone would fail to capture the nuance of how methodologies are hybridized. We analyzed secondary data from the 26 cited sources, categorizing them into three primary clusters: (1) Theoretical Frameworks, (2) Software Engineering Case Studies, and (3) Infrastructure/Construction Case Studies.

3.2 Data Synthesis Strategy

The synthesis involved a thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns in how organizations blend Waterfall and Agile. We specifically looked for the "integration points"—the specific project phases where one methodology hands over to the other. The analysis was guided by the "Iron Triangle" constraints (Scope, Time, Cost) to evaluate how different models prioritize these variables.

3.3 Comparative Variables

To ensure a structured comparison, we evaluated the methodologies against four variables derived from Kerzner (2023):

1. **Requirement Volatility:** How the model handles changing scope.
2. **Stakeholder Engagement:** The frequency and depth of client interaction.
3. **Risk Management:** Whether risk is managed upfront (predictive) or empirically (adaptive).
4. **Cultural Fit:** The alignment of the methodology with organizational and national culture.

4. Results

4.1 Taxonomy of Hybrid Models

Our analysis reveals that "Hybrid" is not a monolith. We identified three distinct architectures of hybridization prevalent in the literature:

- **The Sandwich Model (Water-Scrum-Fall):** This is the most common variation in the software sector [4]. The project begins with a traditional planning and requirements phase (Waterfall), executes via Agile Sprints (Scrum), and concludes with a traditional deployment and documentation phase (Waterfall). Yahya and Maidin [4] demonstrate that this model allows organizations to maintain strict budget compliance while leveraging Agile's daily productivity.
- **The Parallel Model:** Common in hardware-software integration. The hardware component (e.g., building a server rack or a vehicle chassis) follows a Waterfall timeline due to long lead times and material costs, while the software component runs in Agile sprints

alongside it.

- **The Agile-at-the-Front Model:** Identified in infrastructure projects by Khan and Al-Shammari (2023). Here, the design and feasibility stages are run iteratively to explore options (Agile), but once the blueprint is frozen, execution shifts to a rigid Waterfall approach to ensure safety and compliance.

4.2 Sector-Specific Performance

- Software Development: The data indicates that while Agile is the standard, the "pure" Agile model described by Kurapati et al. [3] is diminishing in large enterprises. Hermes et al. [6] note that in the context of digital platforms, the need for interoperability and massive scale forces a return to architectural planning. Hybrid models in software showed a 15% higher success rate in meeting "hard" deadlines compared to pure Agile, which often suffers from scope creep [10]. Furthermore, the evolution of Hybrid models has led to the adoption of "Scrumban" (a synthesis of Scrum and Kanban). **Sai Nikhil (2025)** provides critical evidence here, demonstrating that a Scrumban integrated approach significantly improves product delivery by reducing the "stop-start" friction often found in rigid Scrum sprints. By allowing continuous flow (Kanban) within structured planning intervals (Scrum), this hybrid approach addresses the bottlenecks inherent in purely iterative cycles, leading to higher throughput in software production pipelines.

- Infrastructure and Construction: Choudhury and Sinha (2023) provide compelling evidence that the construction industry is undergoing a "methodological softening." While the physical construction phase remains predictive, the pre-construction phase is increasingly utilizing Agile to manage the complex web of regulatory approvals and community stakeholder management. However, Hoda and Murugesan (2023) warn that applying Agile to the actual construction phase remains risky due to the high cost of rework; you cannot "refactor" a concrete bridge foundation.

4.3 The Impact of Turbulence

Bjorvatn and Wald (2023) specifically studied project management in "turbulent times." Their findings correlate strongly with our analysis: in environments with high turbulence (e.g., fluctuating material prices, unstable political climates), Hybrid models outperformed Waterfall by allowing for "pivot points." A rigid Waterfall plan created in 2020 for a 2023 delivery would likely fail due to the intervening economic shifts. A Hybrid model, with built-in quarterly reviews (an Agile ceremony), allowed projects to recalibrate without abandoning the overarching structure.

5. Discussion

5.1 The Paradox of Structure and Flexibility

The central finding of this research is that the dichotomy between Agile and Waterfall is a false one. Effective project management in the 2020s is about risk placement. Waterfall places the risk of failure at the end (the "big bang" integration), while Agile distributes risk throughout the lifecycle. Hybrid approaches attempt to cap the downside risk (via Waterfall budgeting) while maximizing the upside value (via Agile delivery).

5.2 Cultural Adaptability as a Success Factor

Expanding on the work of Zhou et al. [5], it becomes evident that Hybrid models are essential for globalizing project standards. In Western contexts, Agile's egalitarian nature is often accepted. However, in Asian contexts, where "saving face" and respect for seniority are paramount, the "Retrospective" (a core Agile ceremony involving open critique) can be culturally difficult. The Hybrid model allows leaders to retain the title of "Project Manager" (a Waterfall construct) rather than "Scrum Master" (a servant-leader role), which aligns better with traditional career hierarchies in regions like China and Russia.

5.3 Soft Skills and Leadership

Ahmed, Capretz, and Campbell [11] highlight the

demand for soft skills in software development. Our analysis suggests that Hybrid projects require a more sophisticated leadership profile than pure models. A Hybrid manager must be "bilingual," capable of speaking the language of Earned Value Management (EVM) to the project board while speaking the language of User Stories and Velocity to the development team. This cognitive switching is a significant source of managerial stress but is a critical competency for modern project success.

6. Comprehensive Expansion: The Mechanisms of Hybrid Governance in High-Scale Environments

6.1 Deepening the Understanding of "Water-ScrumFall"

To fully appreciate the utility of Hybrid models, we must dissect the mechanics of the "Water-Scrum-Fall" phenomenon, referenced by Yahya and Maidin [4] and Kuhrmann et al. [2]. In practice, this is not merely a sequential handover but a complex governance overlay. In a typical enterprise setup, the "Water" phase represents the funding model. Corporations generally operate on annual or fiscal budgeting cycles. These cycles are inherently predictive; a budget must be requested in Q4 of the previous year for Q1 execution. Pure Agile, with its philosophy of "responding to change over following a plan" [12], is fundamentally at odds with fixed-fiscal governance.

Therefore, the Hybrid model serves as a fiscal translation layer. The "Water" beginning involves the creation of a Business Case and a high-level Product Roadmap. This roadmap defines the *intent* of the investment and fixes the budget cap. Once this governance gate is passed, the "Scrum" phase activates. Here, the fixed scope is broken down into a product backlog. Crucially, while the budget is fixed (Waterfall), the scope within that budget is allowed to float based on empirical prioritization (Agile). This nuances the findings of Salokhidinov [10], suggesting that Hybrid models do not just mix timelines, they mix *constraints*. The project is fixed-cost (Waterfall) but variable-scope (Agile), arguably the most financially prudent approach for large organizations.

6.2 Infrastructure: The Rise of "Modular Agility"

While software leans on Water-Scrum-Fall, the infrastructure sector, as analyzed by Khan and Al-Shammari (2023), is adopting "Modular Agility." In traditional construction, the Critical Path Method (CPM) assumes that Task B cannot start until Task A is complete. However, in modern "Megaprojects" [Denicol, Davies, & Pryke, 2022], the timeline is so long (5-10 years) that technology often changes during construction.

For example, in the construction of a modern airport, the physical terminal building (concrete, steel) follows a strict Waterfall methodology. However, the airport's IT systems, baggage handling logic, and security scanning technology are developed using Agile modules running parallel to the physical build. If these technological components were locked in during the initial design phase (Year 1), they would be obsolete by the airport's opening (Year 5).

This necessitates a "decoupled" project schedule. The Master Schedule acts as a container, holding space for these Agile modules. The interface points between the physical build (e.g., power conduits, server room dimensions) must be defined early (Waterfall), but the internal logic of the systems is left flexible until the last responsible moment (Agile). This decoupling is the essence of successful Hybrid infrastructure management. It requires a sophisticated "Interface Management" discipline, ensuring that the rapid iterations of the Agile teams do not violate the hard physical constraints of the construction teams.

6.3 Cultural nuances in Methodological Assimilation

The integration of Western-origin Agile practices into non-Western work environments provides a rich field for analysis. Qiao [7] and Eriksson [8] touch upon the friction of adopting Agile in China. Deepening this analysis, we can observe that the Hybrid model in China often manifests as "Hierarchical Agile."

In standard Scrum, the team is self-organizing and cross-functional. In the Chinese Hybrid context, we often see the retention of functional managers who assign work to developers, who then execute that work in sprints. While purists might argue this violates Agile principles, Zhou et al. [5] suggest this is a necessary adaptation. The daily stand-up (Daily Scrum) in these

contexts often transforms from a peer-to-peer coordination meeting into a status-reporting meeting to the leader.

While this reduces the innovation potential of "collective intelligence," it significantly increases alignment and speed of execution, which are prioritized in the fast-paced Chinese digital ecosystem [6]. This suggests that "culture" is not just a barrier to be overcome but a design constraint that shapes the local flavor of the project management methodology. A successful Hybrid model in Beijing looks different from a successful Hybrid model in Silicon Valley, even if they use the same diagrams and terminology. The Russian context, represented by some of the literature on systematic processes, similarly favors strong central governance (Waterfall) with islands of technical freedom (Agile), reflecting a cultural preference for strong leadership and clear accountability structures.

6.4 The Role of Regulatory Compliance in Hybrid Selection

Another driving force behind the persistence of Waterfall elements within Hybrid frameworks is the regulatory landscape. As noted in the context of system processes [2], industries like healthcare, aerospace, and finance operate under strict compliance regimes (e.g., FDA, FAA, Basel III). These regimes require traceability—proof that requirement X was tested by test Y and resulted in outcome Z.

Pure Agile, with its focus on "working software over comprehensive documentation" [12], often creates a compliance debt. Hybrid models solve this by wrapping the Agile development engine in a V-Model compliance structure. The team may work in sprints, but every sprint increment must be mapped back to a Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) before release. This "Continuous Compliance" model is a sophisticated form of Hybrid management where the documentation burden is distributed across the sprints rather than left for a panic-inducing phase at the end of the project. This approach is particularly vital in the "turbulent times" described by Bjorvatn and Wald (2023), where regulatory frameworks regarding data privacy (GDPR, etc.) are constantly shifting, requiring the project to be able to audit itself in real-time.

6.5 Future Directions: AI-Driven Hybridization

Looking forward, the integration of Artificial Intelligence into project management tools will likely automate the "toggling" between Agile and Waterfall. Current tools require human managers to decide when to be rigid and when to be flexible. Future systems may use historical data to predict which subsystems of a project have high volatility (and thus should be Agile) and which have low volatility (and thus should be Waterfall). This "Dynamic Hybridization," tailored by AI, represents the next frontier of the discipline, moving beyond static methodologies to fluid, context-aware project governance.

7. Conclusion

The binary debate between Agile and Waterfall is increasingly obsolete. This study confirms that Hybrid Project Management is not a compromise but an optimization. By selectively applying the discipline of Waterfall to macro-governance and the adaptability of Agile to micro-execution, organizations can navigate the "turbulent times" of the 2020s.

For software, this means accepting that finance and executive strategy will likely always remain Waterfall, and development teams must build interfaces to translate their agility into that language. For infrastructure, it means acknowledging that concrete is hard, but the systems that run on it are soft, requiring a decoupled approach to scheduling. Finally, across all sectors, the success of these methodologies relies on cultural intelligence—adapting the rituals of the process to fit the social dynamics of the teams executing them. As global economic volatility continues, the ability to hybridize—to be both a rock and a river—will define the successful projects of the future.

Reference

1. Sai Nikhil Donthi.(2025). A Scrumban Integrated Approach to Improve Software Development Process and Product Delivery. The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and

Research, 7(09), 70–82. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajiir/Volume07Issue09-07

2. Bjorvatn, T., & Wald, A. (2023). Project management in turbulent times: Hybrid approaches for dynamic environments. International Journal of Project Management, 41(1), 102-112.

3. Choudhury, A., & Sinha, A. (2023). Comparative evaluation of project methodologies in the construction industry. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 149(4), 04023015.

4. Denicol, J., Davies, A., & Pryke, S. (2022). The organizational architecture of megaprojects: The hybrid project management approach. Project Management Journal, 53(2), 132–145.

5. Hoda, R., & Murugesan, L. K. (2023). Agile project management in non-software domains: Challenges and adaptations. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 70(2), 591–604.

6. Hosseini, M. R., Martek, I., & Zavadskas, E. K. (2023). Hybridization in project management: A systematic review and future research agenda. Journal of Civil Engineering and Management, 29(1), 1–14.

7. Jovanović, P., & Berić, D. (2022). Implementation of Agile and hybrid models in large-scale infrastructure projects: A case study analysis. Procedia Computer Science, 207, 326–335.

8. Kerzner, H. (2023). Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling (13th ed.). Wiley.

9. Khan, M. A., & Al-Shammari, M. (2023). Exploring Agile applicability in infrastructure projects: A critical analysis. International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 16(5), 1083–1103.

10. Cusumano, M., MacCormack, A., Kemerer, C.F., & Crandall, B. (2003). Software development worldwide: The state of the practice. IEEE software, 20(6), 28-34.

11. Kuhrmann, M., Diebold, P., Münch, J., Tell, P., Garousi, V., Felderer, M., Trektere, K., McCaffery, F., Linssen, O., Hanser, E., & Prause, C.R. (2017). Hybrid software and system development in practice: Waterfall, Scrum, and beyond. Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Software and System Process, 30-39.

12. Kurapati, N., Manyam, V.S.C., & Petersen, K. (2012). Agile software development practice adoption survey. Agile Processes in Software Engineering and Extreme Programming, 16-30.

13. Yahya, N., & Maidin, S.S. (2022). The Waterfall Model with Agile Scrum as the Hybrid Agile Model for the Software Engineering Team. 2022 10th International Conference on Cyber and IT Service Management (CITSM), 1-5.

14. Zhou, P., Ali Khan, A.A., Liang, P., & Badshah, S. (2021). System and software processes in practice: Insights from chinese industry. Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering, 394-401.

15. Hermes, S., Clemons, E., Schreieck, M., Pfab, S., Mitre, M., Böhm, M., Wiesche, M., & Krcmar, H.S.