CORRECTION

Correction to: Conflict management in agile distributed development: evidence from product development and services engagements

Ashay Saxena[1] · Shankar Venkatagiri[1] · Rajendra K. Bandi[1]

Correction to: Information Technology and Management
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10799-022-00372-w

In the Sect. 5.3.2 heading:

Interplay between Qwnership of code and Team inclusivity in meetings

Instead should say:

Interplay between Ownership of code and Team inclusivity in meetings

In Page 2, line 7:

Alternatively, the functionality can be parcelled out into larger components

Instead should say:

Alternatively, the functionality can be parceled out into larger components

In Page 2, line 15:

ADD implementations are more challenged compared to collocated agile efforts, or distributed efforts with a fixed plan,the distributed setting presents an inherent conflict [46, 63, 64].

Instead should say:

ADD implementations are more challenged compared to collocated agile efforts, or distributed efforts with a fixed plan; the distributed setting presents an inherent conflict [46, 63, 64].

In Page 3, line 10:

Dullemond et al. [24] suggest that agile principles can alleviate risks due to spatial, temporal, and socio-cultural dispersion,each principle has a concomitant effect on team behaviour.

Instead should say:

Dullemond et al. [24] suggest that agile principles can alleviate risks due to spatial, temporal, and socio-cultural dispersion; each principle has a concomitant effect on team behaviour.

In Page 3, Second column, 4th paragraph, line 5:

Cataldo [16] generalizes these concepts to large-scale software systems,a function call from one module to another links the two syntactically, whereas they are semantically linked if one module can affect the execution behaviour of the other.

Instead should say:

Cataldo [16] generalizes these concepts to large-scale software systems; a function call from one module to another links the two syntactically, whereas they are semantically linked if one module can affect the execution behaviour of the other.

In Page 6, Sect. 3.2, line 7:

We have restricted our attention to one case project at a given time,this helps us refine the data collection on an ongoing basis and signal new areas to be explored in subsequent cases.

Instead should say:

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10799-022-00372-w.

✉ Ashay Saxena
  ashay.saxena@iimb.ac.in

  Shankar Venkatagiri
  shankar@iimb.ac.in

  Rajendra K. Bandi
  rbandi@iimb.ac.in

1 Information Systems, Indian Institute of Management Bangalore, Bangalore, India

Springer

We have restricted our attention to one case project at a given time; this helps us refine the data collection on an ongoing basis and signal new areas to be explored in subsequent cases.

In Page 17, line 4:

Ramesh et al. [63; 64] highlight competing demands between the tenets of agile and distributedness in ADD projects,whereas an agile setting relies on informal processes to facilitate coordination, distributed settings typically employ formal mechanisms.

Instead should say:

Ramesh et al. [63; 64] highlight competing demands between the tenets of agile and distributedness in ADD projects; whereas an agile setting relies on informal processes to facilitate coordination, distributed settings typically employ formal mechanisms.

In Page 2, line 1:

Baldwin and Clark (2003) [6] add that modularization helps manage complexity, parallelize work, and accommodate future uncertainty.

Instead should say:

Baldwin and Clark [6] add that modularization helps manage complexity, parallelize work, and accommodate future uncertainty.

In Page 2, line 21:

Moreover, distributed projects must weather challenges from spatial, temporal, as well as configurational dispersion across teams (O'Leary & Cummings, 2007) [56].

Instead should say:

Moreover, distributed projects must weather challenges from spatial, temporal, as well as configurational dispersion across teams [56].

In Page 3, Second column, 2nd Paragraph, line 8:

Persson et al. (2012) [100] suggest that formal control practices which involve measurement and evaluation of outcomes are predominantly carried out in conjunction with an informal clan-like control in the setting.

Instead should say:

Persson et al. [100] suggest that formal control practices which involve measurement and evaluation of outcomes are predominantly carried out in conjunction with an informal clan-like control in the setting.

In Page 3, Second column, line 1:

Building upon these insights, the second theme focuses on the adaptations of agile practices to suit a distributed project context (cf. Šmite et al. 2010) [69].

Instead should say:

Building upon these insights, the second theme focuses on the adaptations of agile practices to suit a distributed project context (cf. [69].

In Page 8, Section "4", line 1:

This study adopts a neutral and passive perspective (Dubé & Paré, 2003) [23].

Instead should say:

This study adopts a neutral and passive perspective [23].

In Page 8, Section "4", line 9:

Coding techniques suggested by Corbin & Strauss [19] and Saldaña (2014) have been adopted to form multiple levels of code, from open to selective.

Instead should say:

Coding techniques suggested by Corbin & Strauss [19] and Saldaña [66] have been adopted to form multiple levels of code, from open to selective.

In Table 6,

Note: 'High' on both these dimensions (*) signifies ambidexterity (Napier et al. 2011) [101].

Instead should say:

Note: 'High' on both these dimensions (*) signifies ambidexterity [101].

On Page 16, Section 6.1, Second Paragraph, line 4:

Ramesh et al. [28, 64, 65] have characterized the elements of contextual ambidexterity, which guides business units and teams to handle conflicting forces.

Instead should say:

Ramesh et al. [64; 65] highlight competing demands between the tenets of agile and distributedness in ADD projects; whereas an agile setting relies on informal processes to facilitate coordination, distributed settings typically employ formal mechanisms. Our study provides insights beyond this conceptualization of the central conflict in ADD settings. Our research identifies contextual elements that help us characterize the dynamics of these conflicting forces.

This study has implications for the theory of ambidexterity, which has been recognized as a valuable approach to understanding the dynamics of contin-

gencies faced by organizations, business units and/or teams. Gibson and Birkinshaw [28] have characterized the elements of contextual ambidexterity, which guides business units and teams to handle conflicting forces.

On Page 16, Section 6.1, Third Paragraph, line 7:

Ramesh et al. [28, 64, 65] adopted by software teams, we leverage the notion of project context in each ADD setting to derive insights.

Instead should say:

Ramesh et al. [64, 65] suggest practices in the form of formal and informal processes, which give rise to specific mitigation strategies to the conflicting demands. They map these strategies to the well-known anteced-ents (discipline, stretch, support and trust) of contextual ambidexterity.

Our work builds upon the approaches of the predecessors and specializes it further. Rather than directly focusing on general strategies (cf. [28] adopted by software teams, we leverage the notion of project context in each ADD setting to derive insights.