

2-18-2026

Risk Management Strategies for Project Efficiency

Paulisa Janel Scarlett
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Management and Human Potential

This is to certify that the doctoral study by

Paulisa Janel Scarlett

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Carol-Anne Faint, Committee Chairperson, Doctor of Business Administration
Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost

Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University

2026

Abstract

Risk Management Strategies for Project Efficiency

by

Paulisa Janel Scarlett

MBA, Texas A&M University - Central Texas

BS, Texas A&M University – Central Texas

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

February 2026

Abstract

Ineffective risk management strategies negatively impact organizational leaders due to potential project failures, financial losses, and diminished stakeholder trust. Grounded in general systems theory, this qualitative pragmatic inquiry was to explore senior project managers' risk management strategies for enhancing project outcomes, efficiency, and profitability. Nine senior project managers from construction, software development, marketing, mechanical engineering, and automotive manufacturing, all overseeing complex, high-risk projects, participated in the study. Data were collected through semistructured interviews, organizational reports, and project documents. Thematic analysis, using Braun and Clarke's six-step process, was employed to identify patterns aligned with the research questions. Five major themes emerged: integration of risk management tools and techniques, continuous evaluation and adaptive metrics, efficiency and organizational value enhancement, leadership and team dynamics optimization, and industry-specific adaptations to challenges. One recommendation is to improve engagement between leaders and employees to optimize communication related to how strategies are implemented. The implications for positive social change include enabling organizational leaders and project managers to foster more transparent and collaborative work environments, improving employee well-being and contributing to the timely delivery of products and services that benefit communities.

Risk Management Strategies for Project Efficiency

by

Paulisa Janel Scarlett

MBA, Texas A&M University - Central Texas

BS, Texas A&M University – Central Texas

Doctoral Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Business Administration

Walden University

February 2026

Dedication

To my husband, who has been my rock and my inspiration throughout this journey. To my children, whose laughter and love gave me the strength to persevere. And to my family, whose unwavering support and encouragement made this work possible. A special thank you to my father, who invested in my education and believed in my potential from the very beginning. Your belief in me means everything.

Acknowledgments

My academic journey has been shaped by the guidance and support of many remarkable individuals. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Faint who provided invaluable mentorship and unwavering commitment to my academic growth. To my professors, whose expertise and dedication have enriched my understanding and challenged me to push beyond my comfort zone, thank you for fostering an environment of intellectual curiosity and academic excellence.

I am grateful to my research colleagues and fellow students who have contributed to my work through stimulating discussions, constructive feedback, and collaborative spirit. Your insights and companionship have made this journey both enlightening and enjoyable.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to my family for their endless patience, understanding, and encouragement. To my supportive husband, who shouldered extra responsibilities to give me time to study; to my children Preston and Princess, who showed remarkable patience during long study sessions; and especially to my father, whose steadfast support of my educational pursuits made this achievement possible, your love and support have been my foundation throughout this journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	v
Section 1: Foundation of the Study.....	1
Background of the Problem	1
Problem and Purpose	3
Population and Sampling.....	6
Population	6
Sampling	6
Nature of the Study	7
Research Question	8
Interview Questions	8
Conceptual Framework.....	9
Operational Definitions.....	10
Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations.....	11
Assumptions.....	11
Limitations	12
Delimitations.....	12
Significance of the study.....	13
A Review of Professional and Academic Literature	14
Project Management Risk Mitigation Strategies	16
Organizational Project Management Maturity.....	19
Risk Management in Information-Constrained Environments.....	21

Technology Adoption and Risk in Project Management	24
Prioritizing Project Management Processes in Risk Mitigation	26
Contextual and Disaster Risk Perspectives.....	27
Technology-Driven Risk Challenges and Adaptive Strategies	28
Evolving Project Management Maturity Models and Governance.....	28
Sector-Specific Risk Management Strategies	30
Sustainability and Emerging Risk Frameworks.....	32
Lean Construction and Agile Practices in Risk Reduction	33
Research Limitations	34
Conclusion	35
Transition	36
Section 2: The Project.....	38
Purpose Statement.....	38
Role of the Researcher	38
Participants.....	39
Research Method and Design	39
Population and Sampling	40
Population	40
Sampling	40
Ethical Research.....	41
Data Collection Instruments	42
Data Collection Technique.....	43

Data Organization Technique.....	43
Data Analysis	44
Reliability and Validity	44
Reliability.....	44
Validity	45
Transition and Summary	46
Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change	47
Introduction.....	47
Presentation of the Findings.....	47
Theme 1: Integrated Risk Management Tools and Techniques (100%)	49
Theme 2: Continuous Evaluation and Adaptive Metrics (75%)	50
Theme 3: Efficiency, Profitability, and Organizational Value (50%)	51
Theme 4: Leadership, Communication, and Team Dynamics (75%).....	52
Theme 5: Challenges and Industry-Specific Adaptations (25%).....	53
Applications to Professional Practice	56
Implications for Social Change.....	56
Recommendations for Action	58
Recommendations for Further Research.....	60
Reflections	61
Conclusion	62
References	64
Appendix A: Interview Protocol	80

Appendix B: Interview Questions.....81

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Reference Types and Their Percentages.....	14
Table 2. Participant Profile and Industry Overview.....	48
Table 3. Theme Summary Table	55

Section 1: Foundation of the Study

Organizations increasingly rely on projects to achieve growth, foster innovation, and attain strategic transformation in competitive markets (Lee & Kim, 2023). Despite ongoing advances in project management methodologies, many organizations continue to encounter challenges in delivering projects within established timeframes and budgets, resulting in significant financial losses and lost opportunities (Aaron, Gallage et al., 2023).

Persistent gaps remain between project management theory and practical outcomes, as businesses struggle to translate best practices into effective execution amid complex and dynamic environments (Osei-Kyei et al., 2023). Addressing the underlying causes of project failure represents not only a significant academic concern but also an urgent applied business problem with direct implications for organizational sustainability, profitability, and competitive positioning. By exploring the practical factors that contribute to project delays and cost overruns, this study aims to inform actionable solutions for practitioners seeking to enhance project performance in complex, dynamic environments.

Background of the Problem

Project management effectiveness exerts a direct and measurable influence on organizational success in today's highly competitive business environment. Persistent challenges in delivering projects within established constraints continue to reveal a gap between theoretical frameworks and practical outcomes. Aaron, Gallage et al. (2023) identified and evaluated key risk factors contributing to cost overruns in public sector

construction projects, finding that project funding problems and client-driven changes are among the most critical contributors. These findings demonstrate that even with significant investments in project management training and process improvements, organizations frequently fail to achieve consistent project outcomes. This ongoing disconnect suggests a need to revisit traditional approaches and consider new solutions for improving project performance.

Relying solely on technical expertise is insufficient for achieving success in complex project environments. Competency frameworks, such as those described by Papp-Horváth et al. (2024), emphasize the importance of leadership, communication, and systems thinking for project managers facing dynamic and interconnected challenges. General systems theory (Von Bertalanffy, 1968) supports this perspective by highlighting how risks in one area of a project can influence outcomes across the entire initiative. Developing these broader competencies enables project managers to respond more effectively to unforeseen issues and to manage complexity across organizational boundaries. Adopting a system-oriented mindset is therefore essential for navigating the multifaceted nature of modern projects.

Integrated risk management strategies are critical for successful project delivery and organizational competitiveness. Evidence from supply chain management literature demonstrates that delays and disruptions in one segment can cascade throughout a project, amplifying costs and jeopardizing outcomes (Robles, 2023). These cascading effects underline the necessity of comprehensive risk management practices that extend beyond isolated technical solutions. As organizations increasingly rely on projects to

drive strategic transformation and growth, the development of robust risk management capabilities becomes a key determinant of long-term success.

Addressing the persistent gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application in project management requires actionable strategies tailored to real-world complexities. The present study sought to identify practical approaches that project managers can use to minimize cost overruns and schedule delays in evolving business environments. By examining these strategies, the research aims to contribute to both scholarly understanding and practical improvement in project risk management.

Problem and Purpose

The general business problem is that current project management risk management approaches create a critical knowledge gap in effective risk management strategies, that inadequately address the multifaceted risk factors, contributing to project delays and cost escalations in the United States' adverse and complex business environments (Ottaviani et al., 2024). Aaron, Martin et al. (2023) provided empirical evidence from public sector construction projects, identifying critical risk factors such as project funding problems and client-driven variations that contribute significantly to cost overruns. Silva et al. (2023) further highlighted the dynamic nature of risk in complex project environments, emphasizing the necessity for adaptable risk capabilities to manage evolving challenges effectively. These ongoing risks underscore the critical need for improved mitigation strategies tailored to increasingly complex and dynamic business environments.

The specific business problem is that some project managers in the United States lack risk management strategies to increase organizational performance and profitability. (Simushi & Wium, 2020). Robles (2023) demonstrated that ineffective risk management practices in project management methodologies have advanced in recent years Ottaviani et al. (2024) emphasized that formal project management capabilities often fall short when managing complex, dynamic risks encountered during project execution. Complexities in project management may hinder implementation performance. Organizational leaders may disregard quality checks in exchange for efficiency. Osei-Kyei et al. (2023) also noted that organizations face significant challenges in implementing best practices effectively, creating a disconnect between theoretical knowledge and practical application. This creates a significant knowledge gap regarding effective risk mitigation strategies that can adapt to evolving organizational contexts and complexities.

The purpose of this qualitative pragmatic inquiry study was to explore effective risk management strategies that project managers in U.S. organizations can implement to minimize to increase organizational performance and profitability. Grounded in general systems theory (von Bertalanffy, 1968), this study recognizes that project management challenges must be understood within the broader system of interconnected organizational processes. Papp-Horváth et al. (2024) highlighted the evolution of project competencies and the growing importance of developing leadership, communication, and systems thinking skills to navigate contemporary business challenges. Additionally, Martínez and Pérez (2024) emphasized the role of organizational culture in shaping

project management maturity, reinforcing the need for integrated approaches that consider both human and systemic factors.

Through semistructured interviews with nine senior project managers who have successfully delivered projects within budget and schedule constraints, this study aimed to develop a practical framework for risk mitigation. The framework can enable organizational leaders to enhance project success rates and safeguard business value by focusing on three critical areas: strategic alignment between project outcomes and organizational objectives, operational efficiency in risk identification and response procedures, and financial controls with metrics for early detection of potential overruns. Wang and Chen (2022) provided insights into adaptive risk management in digital ecosystems, underscoring the importance of flexibility and responsiveness in today's rapidly changing project environments.

This study addressed a vital business need by investigating how organizational leaders can strengthen project management processes to protect profit margins and sustain competitive market positions. The findings provide actionable strategies for business leaders to improve project performance and consistently deliver strategic initiatives within defined constraints. Understanding the systemic nature of project risks and their impact on business outcomes, organizations can develop more effective approaches to project management and risk mitigation (Robles, 2023). By focusing on both the technical and human elements of project risk, this research sought to empower organizations to achieve greater resilience and long-term success

Population and Sampling

Population

The population for this study consisted of senior project managers in the United States who had direct experience managing large-scale projects. Eligible individuals must have had at least 3 years of project management experience and could hold a recognized project management certification, such as PMP or PRINCE2. This population represents professionals operating in high-stakes business environments where effective risk management is critical to project success (Huang et al., 2023; Lee & Kim, 2023; Martínez & Pérez, 2024). Focusing on this specific population ensured that the study drew from individuals with substantial expertise and firsthand knowledge of risk management in complex, high pressure settings. These insights are essential for understanding the practices that drive successful project outcomes.

Sampling

Using purposive sampling, nine participants were selected based on their demonstrated history of successfully delivering projects within budget and on schedule. Participants were recruited through professional networking platforms and industry associations to ensure access to individuals with relevant expertise. Eligible individuals must have had at least 3 years of project management experience and could hold a recognized project management certification, such as PMP or PRINCE2. Data collection was conducted through semistructured interviews, enabling an in-depth exploration of the risk management strategies employed by project managers in complex organizational contexts and available documentation or bulletins gained from interviewees or

organizational websites (see Osei-Kyei, Chan, & Chen, 2023; Papp-Horváth et al., 2024). By carefully selecting experienced and credentialed participants, this study aimed to gather nuanced perspectives that reflect real world expertise in project risk management. This approach is designed to provide rich, context-like project environments.

Nature of the Study

A qualitative methodology was most appropriate for this study as it enabled the exploration of complex business phenomena within their natural context and allows for the discovery of underlying patterns in project management practices (see Papp-Horváth et al., 2024). Qualitative research provides the flexibility needed to understand how project managers develop and implement risk mitigation strategies while accounting for the dynamic nature of modern business environments. Unlike quantitative methodology, which focuses on statistical relationships and hypothesis testing, qualitative methodology facilitates the deep exploration of project managers' decision-making processes and the contextual factors that influence project outcomes (Mansell et al., 2020). Qualitative methodology aligned with this study's purpose of uncovering effective strategies for managing project risks and preventing cost overruns and delays.

The pragmatic inquiry design was selected for this study because it enabled a systematic investigation of practical solutions to real-world business problems while maintaining scientific rigor. The pragmatic inquiry design allows for the examination of project managers' experiences through a practical lens, focusing on what works in actual business settings rather than purely theoretical constructs (Ottaviani et al., 2024). Through semistructured interviews with project managers who have successfully

managed complex projects, the pragmatic inquiry design facilitates the identification of effective risk management strategies that can be applied in similar business contexts. This design is preferred over phenomenological design. The phenomenological design requires dozens of participants and focuses on lived experiences only (Simushi & Wium, 2020). Choosing a qualitative, pragmatic approach ensured that the study captured the nuanced realities of risk management in contemporary project settings. This methodology supports the discovery of actionable insights and practical strategies that reflect the complexities and demands faced by today's project managers.

Research Question

What risk management strategies do project managers use in the United States use to increase project management efficiencies?

Interview Questions

1. What risk management tools have you used to increase project management efficiencies?
2. How do you assess the effectiveness of the risk management strategies applied?
3. How often do you assess the effectiveness of risk management strategies applied?
4. How do project management efficiency strategies affect overall project costs?
5. How do project management efficiency strategies affect the overall performance of the organization?

6. How do project management efficiency strategies affect the overall profitability of the organization?
7. How might you change or adapt project management efficiency strategies to further improve costs, performance challenges, or profitability needs?
8. What results would you expect to see from any changes or adjustments made to your strategies?
9. What additional information can you provide to help me understand project management efficiency strategies?
10. Is there any additional information you would like to share?

Conceptual Framework

This study was grounded in systems theory, originally developed by Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968). Systems theory emphasizes the interconnectedness of organizational components and the dynamic interplay between subsystems, asserting that changes in one part of a system can significantly influence the entire system. In project initiatives, equipment delays or malfunctions can trigger widespread project setbacks, resulting in organizational performance issues, potential layoffs, and recruitment slowdowns, and dissatisfied stakeholders that may ultimately lead to lost business and damaged relationships.

Applying systems theory provided a valuable lens for examining how project managers identify, assess, and manage risks within these interconnected environments, especially under conditions of limited or evolving information. Concepts such as feedback loops and holistic analysis enabled this study to capture how project managers

adapt to emerging challenges, communicate across teams, and make decisions that affect multiple project facets simultaneously (see Orieno et al., 2024). The systems theory framework informed the development of interview questions that explore these interdependencies and guides the organization and analysis of qualitative data to reflect the complexity of project risk management. Projects consist of multiple interdependent elements such as tasks, teams, and resources. Risks in one area, such as delays or resource shortages, can cascade and impact overall project outcomes (Silva et al., 2023; Wang & Chen, 2022).

Grounding the study in systems theory allows for a richer exploration of how risks ripple across project components and influence decision making. This perspective helps illuminate the adaptive strategies project managers use to maintain control and balance when faced with uncertainty.

Operational Definitions

Cost overrun: The excess of actual project costs over the originally estimated costs, typically resulting from inaccurate estimates, unforeseen complications, or ineffective risk management (Flyvbjerg, 2014).

Knowledge gap: The lack of critical information or understanding necessary to make informed decisions during a project often leading to increased risk and uncertainty (Saunders et al., 2019).

Project delay: A deviation from the planned project schedule that results in the late completion of project milestones or deliverables due to various internal or external factors (Williams, 2003).

Project management: The application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to project activities to meet project requirements and achieve specific goals within defined constraints (Project Management Institute [PMI], 2021).

Risk management: A systematic process of identifying, analyzing, and responding to project risks to minimize the likelihood and impact of adverse events on project objectives (Hillson & Murray-Webster, 2017).

Stakeholder: Any individual or group that has an interest in the outcome of a project, including sponsors, team members, customers, and external partners (Freeman, 1984).

Systems theory: A conceptual framework that views organizations as complex, interrelated systems where each component affects and is affected by other components, emphasizing holistic analysis and interdependence (von Bertalanffy, 1968).

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Every research study is shaped by underlying assumptions, inherent limitations, and deliberate delimitations that define the scope and context of the inquiry. Acknowledgment of these elements is essential for interpreting findings and understanding the overall contribution to the field of project management (Saunders et al., 2019; Yin, 2018).

Assumptions

This study assumed that senior project managers employed in the United States would provide honest and accurate accounts of project management experiences and risk management strategies. This study also assumed that these senior project managers

possessed insights relevant to the broader population of project managers in the United States. Purposive sampling was employed to select qualified participants, and confidentiality was emphasized to encourage candid and truthful responses, mitigating risks associated with these assumptions (see Nguyen et al., 2023; Papp-Horváth et al., 2024). By acknowledging these assumptions, this study aimed to foster transparency and trust in both the research process and results.

Limitations

This study's reliance on self-reported data collected from a relatively small sample of senior project managers may introduce bias and restrict the generalizability of findings (see Aaron, Martin et al., 2023). The qualitative design prioritizes in-depth exploration over statistical representation, which may limit applicability to project managers in other industries or organizational contexts (see Creswell & Poth, 2018). Data triangulation and member checking was employed to enhance credibility and trustworthiness, mitigating risks related to these limitations (see Orieno et al., 2024; Silva et al., 2023). Recognizing these limitations ensures that readers can interpret the findings with an understanding of where caution may be necessary.

Delimitations

This study is delimited to project managers with recent experience delivering large-scale projects. The focus is specifically on risk management strategies related to project delays and cost overruns, excluding other project management areas such as resource allocation or stakeholder engagement unless directly related to risk (see Papp-Horváth et al., 2024). Findings will not be generalized beyond this defined population

and scope of inquiry (Atoum & Al-Zu'bi, 2024; Yin, 2018). To mitigate risks associated with these delimitations, this study defined its scope clearly and encourages future research to explore related areas and broader populations (see Martínez & Pérez, 2024). Clarifying these delimitations helps to establish clear boundaries for this study and highlights opportunities for future research.

Significance of the study

Understanding and managing risk in complex projects remains a pressing challenge for organizations seeking to achieve strategic objectives within budget and schedule constraints (Simushi & Wium, 2020; Williams, 2003). This study is significant because it addresses a critical knowledge gap by exploring effective risk management strategies employed by project managers in the United States (Papp-Horváth et al., 2024). By providing practical, evidence-based insights, the research aims to support project managers, practitioners, and organizational leaders in aligning project goals with business objectives and improving overall project outcomes (Kenny, 2003).

The implications of this study extend beyond business practice, offering potential benefits for positive social change. Enhanced project management processes can lead to the successful delivery of products, services, and infrastructure that improve quality of life for individuals and communities (Gemünden et al., 2018). Additionally, the adoption of effective risk management strategies may promote economic growth by increasing organizational efficiency and profitability (Simushi & Wium, 2020). The findings may inform new policies, training programs, and future research directions, encouraging

continuous improvement in project management and contributing to the broader development of organizations and society.

A Review of Professional and Academic Literature

To develop a comprehensive understanding of project management risk mitigation strategies, a systematic literature search was conducted across multiple scholarly databases, including ProQuest, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. Keywords such as “project management,” “risk mitigation,” “cost overruns,” “project delays,” “organizational maturity,” and “information uncertainty” were used in various combinations to capture relevant peer-reviewed journal articles, dissertations, and seminal books published between 2021 and 2025. Inclusion criteria prioritized studies that focus on applied business contexts, particularly those examining risk management in large-scale projects within the United States and other comparable economies. This approach ensured the selection of current, credible, and relevant literature that informs both the theoretical framework and practical challenges addressed in this study. Table 1 shows the summary of reference types and their percentages.

Table 1

Summary of Reference Types and Their Percentages

Reference type	Older	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Percentages
Peer-reviewed	2	0	9	8	25	11	80%
Dissertations	0	0	1	2	2	8	12%
Government pubs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Textbooks	2	0	0	1	0	0	4%
Other reports	0	0	0	0	0	2	4%
Total	4	0	10	11	27	21	100%

The landscape of modern project management continues to evolve amid rising complexity and uncertainty across industries. Organizations still wrestle with cost overruns and project delays, issues that cut across construction, technology, and energy sectors alike (Huang et al., 2023; Ibeanu et al 2023). These persistent challenges reveal that despite advances, project management struggles remain deeply rooted in practice. This research highlights the critical role of organizational project management maturity in addressing these challenges. Al-Sarayreh and Al-Tahat (2023) demonstrated how maturity models can guide organizations toward improved project outcomes amid complexity. Button's (2019) study on aerospace development programs emphasized ongoing difficulties with time and cost management, while Boonstra and Reezigt (2023) proposed a comprehensive framework for managing complexity in project strategies.

Information constraints and stakeholder dynamics add further complexity to project management. Orieno et al. (2024) explored how uncertainty in project information impacts risk management decisions, and Uddin et al. (2023) analyzed stakeholder engagement variability across different project types, revealing its effect on project success. Supply chain considerations are also crucial. Robles (2023) investigated the risks of fast-track projects prone to cost and schedule overruns from a supply chain perspective, underscoring the need for integrated risk management approaches.

Synthesizing recent scholarship from 2020 to 2025, this review identified ongoing gaps in project risk management practice. Varajão et al. (2022) provided insights into project management processes influencing information systems project success, while

Papp-Horváth et al. (2024) charted the evolution of project management competence through a systematic literature review.

Project Management Risk Mitigation Strategies

Building on the evolving understanding of project management challenges highlighted earlier, the theoretical foundation of contemporary risk mitigation strategies rests squarely on systems theory and contingency approaches. These frameworks are key to making sense of the complex, dynamic environments that modern projects inhabit.

Systems theory, rooted in von Bertalanffy's seminal work on general system theory (1968), insists that projects must be viewed as interconnected systems rather than isolated tasks. Button's (2019) study of aerospace development programs vividly illustrated the complex interactions among organizational components within projects. Recent reviews echo this, advocating holistic, systems-based risk management approaches that account for the interplay between technical elements, organizational structures, and environmental influences (Abiola et al., 2023; Osei-Kyei et al., 2023). Expanding on this, Ibeanu et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of recognizing relationships between project elements and stakeholders. Their work aligns with a growing body of research showing that rigid, one-size-fits-all management strategies fall short in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments. Khan et al. (2024) and Qazi et al. (2021) argued convincingly for adaptive, resilient risk mitigation methods tailored to the unique demands of each project. Supporting this, Uddin et al. (2023) and Robles (2023) used data-driven analyses to demonstrate how shifts in

stakeholder engagement and information flow can dramatically influence project success, especially in fast-paced, high-uncertainty projects.

Systems theory's holistic perspective enables project managers to spot interdependencies and anticipate cascading effects, which can enhance proactive risk identification. One clear advantage is its ability to foster collaboration across functions and spot systemic weaknesses before they escalate. Yet, its complexity can also be a drawback attempting to account for every variable may slow decision-making or obscure urgent issues. In highly dynamic environments, the sheer volume of interactions can become overwhelming, making it hard to act quickly when risks arise. Despite these challenges, systems theory remains valuable for understanding the full landscape of project risks.

Contingency theory complements this by rejecting universal solutions, instead advocating for strategies that flex with organizational and environmental contexts. Huang et al. (2023) found that organizations with higher project management maturity are better able to adapt their risk responses, leading to improved outcomes. This perspective is reinforced by Abiola et al. (2023) and Qazi et al. (2021), who showed that flexible, context-sensitive risk strategies outperform rigid adherence to standard processes in complex projects. The interplay of project systems is particularly clear when examining information flow and stakeholder dynamics. Uddin et al. (2023) revealed that variability in stakeholder engagement across sectors has a direct impact on project outcomes. Orieno et al. (2024) further highlighted how uncertainty around information timing and quality shapes risk management decisions throughout the project lifecycle. Together, these

studies stress the value of structural alignment and agile communication in managing project complexity.

Contingency theory offers the clear benefit of flexibility, encouraging project teams to adapt their strategies as conditions change. This responsiveness can help organizations avoid the pitfalls of rigid processes in unpredictable environments. On the downside, the lack of a clear, universal template may make it difficult for less experienced teams to know which approach fits best. Overreliance on “it depends” thinking can sometimes lead to inconsistency or indecision, particularly in high-pressure situations. Even so, the adaptability it promotes is crucial in settings where no two projects or their risks are ever quite the same.

Robles’s (2023) insights into fast-track projects underscored the added risk in crisis-prone contexts, where rapid adjustments and evidence-based responses are essential. Khan et al. (2024) and Osei-Kyei et al. (2023) echoed this, emphasizing the need for continuous monitoring and rapid response frameworks to keep pace with evolving risks. Bringing these threads together, the integration of systems theory, contingency approaches, and up-to-date evidence-based practices equips project managers with nuanced, context-aware tools for risk mitigation. Papp-Horváth et al.’s (2024) systematic review of project management competence highlighted the importance of ongoing learning and adaptability in mastering complex organizational systems. This evolving competence enables project leaders to navigate uncertainty with greater agility and confidence.

Evidence-based, rapid response frameworks are praised for their agility and real-time adjustment to emerging risks. Their chief advantage is the ability to spot and act on threats as soon as they arise, minimizing potential impacts. However, these strategies require robust data systems and highly skilled teams, which not all organizations have. There's also the risk of overcorrecting or making hasty decisions without all the necessary information. Still, for projects facing tight deadlines or crisis conditions, these approaches can make the difference between success and failure.

In summary, effective project risk mitigation hinges on four pillars: treating projects as complex, interconnected systems; embracing flexible, context-specific strategies; understanding the fluid dynamics of stakeholders and information; and committing to continuous learning and adaptation. By weighing the strengths and limitations of systems theory, contingency thinking, and evidence-based adaptation, project managers can build toolkits that are both comprehensive and practical. The most effective risk mitigation strategies are those that blend structure with flexibility, allowing teams to respond confidently and decisively in the face of uncertainty.

Organizational Project Management Maturity

This study employed a qualitative pragmatic approach to explore project management risk mitigation strategies within the context of organizational maturity. The pragmatic inquiry approach emphasizes practical solutions to real-world problems by integrating diverse perspectives and methods. This methodology supports the identification of actionable strategies that address complex organizational challenges,

focusing on outcomes that are both effective and applicable within varied professional contexts.

Focusing on subjective experience reveals how project managers interpret organizational maturity and complexity in their decision-making processes. Al-Sarayreh and Al-Tahat (2023) and Amarneh and Awwad (2023) emphasized the value of capturing these lived realities to enhance risk mitigation within mature organizations. Mhatre and Mehta (2023) further argued that pragmatic inquiry exposes organizational decision-making complexities frequently overlooked by traditional quantitative methods.

Methodological trends in project management increasingly favor qualitative and mixed methods to address the field's complexity. Prasetyo et al. (2024) documented the rise of qualitative research, underscoring its effectiveness in capturing the multifaceted realities of project management. This aligns with findings in organizational project management maturity, where mixed methods integrate qualitative depth with quantitative rigor to yield comprehensive insights into organizational phenomena (Atoum & Al-Zu'bi, 2024; Javed et al., 2021).

Contemporary scholarship underscores the need for rigorous yet flexible methodologies capable of reflecting the dynamic relationship between maturity and organizational performance. Lee and Kim (2021) and Sari and Kusuma (2023) highlighted the importance of methodological adaptability in capturing the evolving complexities of project management environments. These studies advocated approaches that penetrate beyond surface descriptions to explore how project managers make sense of risk and maturity within their organizational settings.

Vergara et al. (2025) reinforced that exploring themes such as decision-making and organizational complexity requires methodologies prioritizing deep contextual understanding. Pragmatic inquiry, therefore, offers a sophisticated response aligned with current project management research needs, providing insights that inform risk mitigation strategies tailored to organizational maturity. Finally, the integration of mixed methods approaches, supported by Al-Tabtabai and Al-Hajj (2022) and Martínez and Pérez (2024), strengthened this study by combining qualitative nuance with quantitative breadth. This holistic approach would enable a richer understanding of project risk mitigation, capturing subtle organizational dynamics often missed by purely quantitative studies and remains inappropriate for this research study.

Risk Management in Information-Constrained Environments

The methodological approach outlined previously emphasized the critical need to understand complex organizational challenges. This is significant within environments marked by information uncertainty (Cruz-Feldman, 2023; Orieno et al., 2024). In today's project management landscape, navigating uncertainty has become as vital as traditional planning methodologies. Scholars have increasingly stressed the necessity for adaptive, data-informed, and flexible risk management techniques that respond to rapidly evolving conditions (Khan et al., 2024; Zhang & Wang, 2023). The rapidity with which changes occur within the business environment is best understood by using best practices, risk management strategies that can help mitigate complex or unforeseen obstacles.

Risk management in contemporary project settings presents unique complexities where information is incomplete, delayed, or of questionable reliability. The ongoing

digital transformation of organizations has fundamentally shifted how risks are identified, assessed, and mitigated, compelling project managers to embrace more sophisticated and nuanced frameworks (Durdyev, 2021; Goswami, 2024; Herrera et al., 2021). These new paradigms move beyond deterministic models towards probabilistic, scenario-based, and hybrid approaches that better capture the fluidity of modern risks (Lee et al., 2023; Patel & Singh, 2022).

Building on this, Aaron, Martin et al. (2023) proposed a fuzzy synthetic evaluation method to assess risks under uncertainty, illustrating the value of computational intelligence in managing ambiguous information. Their approach underlines the inadequacy of purely quantitative risk assessments, advocating for context-sensitive frameworks that integrate qualitative insights and real-time data analytics (Vergara et al., 2025). This reflects a broader trend toward holistic risk management models that combine data-driven algorithms with expert judgment and adaptive learning (Silva et al., 2023; Wang & Chen, 2022). Foundational work by Okehi (2014), though earlier, has continued to resonate in contemporary discourse by highlighting that effective risk management is not about eradicating risk but developing adaptive strategies capable of responding to emergent challenges controls (Cruz-Feldman, 2023; Orieno et al., 2024; Tanaka & Fujimoto, 2021). This perspective aligns closely with recent empirical studies emphasizing that organizational resilience depends on dynamic risk capabilities rather than static.

Various researchers have advanced this concept. Robles (2023) expanded this understanding through an analysis of fast-track projects, revealing how constrained

information within supply chains exacerbates project risks. His findings indicated that project managers must cultivate sophisticated data-gathering and interpretation skills to make timely decisions despite incomplete information (Durdyev, 2021; Goswami, 2024; Herrera et al., 2021; Kumar & Singh, 2023; Moreno et al., 2022). This underscores the importance of integrating supply chain risk management with project risk frameworks, a viewpoint supported by recent research advocating for cross-disciplinary risk integration.

Conversely, some perspectives vary and add context to the understanding of risk management strategies. An alternative viewpoint has suggested that while adaptive strategies are crucial, an overreliance on flexibility without foundational risk governance can introduce vulnerabilities (Fernandez & Rainey, 2021). These scholars argued for balanced approaches that combine robust risk controls with adaptive responsiveness to information gaps. Recent frameworks have proposed multilayered risk governance structures that are both proactive and reactive, blending strategic oversight with agile operational tactics (Nguyen et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024). Collectively, these perspectives reinforce a core insight: risk management in information-constrained environments is less about precise prediction and more about agile adaptation (Orieno et al., 2024; Vergara et al., 2025). The development of flexible, responsive strategies that enable rapid interpretation and mitigation of emergent risks has become a defining competency for project managers across sectors.

Still, not all scholars agree on the primacy of adaptability. For example, Fernandez and Rainey (2021) argued that while flexible strategies help organizations cope with uncertainty, too much reliance on flexibility can weaken core risk controls and

introduce new vulnerabilities. They pointed out that organizations sometimes swing too far toward agility, neglecting the need for robust governance structures that anchor decision-making. In practice, this means that an organization might react quickly to changing information but fail to establish consistent protocols, leading to confusion or oversight during critical moments. This view has led to the development of multi-layered risk governance frameworks, which balance proactive oversight with agile operational tactics.

Organizations that excel are those that leverage advanced analytics, foster cross-functional collaboration, and maintain continuous learning processes to dynamically manage uncertainty (Khan et al., 2024; Patel & Singh, 2022; Silva et al., 2023). In addition to information constraints, the challenges surrounding technology adoption have become increasingly prominent in contemporary risk management. Considering both adaptive and governance-focused strategies, project managers are better positioned to navigate uncertainty and respond to the demands of information constrained environments.

Technology Adoption and Risk in Project Management

While information constraints and stakeholder variability remain central to project risk, the rapid adoption of new technologies has introduced a distinct and evolving set of challenges for project managers. As organizations increasingly depend on digital tools, data platforms, and integrated systems to coordinate complex projects, the risks associated with technology adoption have gained new urgency (Norman et al., 2023; Saghafian et al., 2021).

Recent scholarship has underscored that technology dependence can amplify organizational vulnerability. For example, Norman et al. (2023) found that organizations' rapid digital transformation during crisis periods such as the COVID-19 pandemic exposed new weaknesses in project continuity and resilience. Saghafian et al. (2021) added that this dependence can foster overconfidence and reduce preparedness for technical disruptions, with cascading effects on project outcomes. Cybersecurity threats are now a persistent shadow over technology-enabled project management. Qian et al. (2012) argued that organizations often approach security reactively, leaving systems exposed during periods of rapid change or integration. This is compounded by the ongoing challenge of data privacy compliance. Klymenko et al. (2023) documented the practical difficulties organizations face in translating privacy policies into robust technical measures, especially as new technologies outpace regulatory and organizational adaptation.

The literature has also highlighted the underestimated learning curve associated with adopting new project technologies. Plaza et al. (2010) showed that inadequate training, unrealistic timelines, and resistance to change can significantly undermine technology-driven projects. These human-centered risks ranging from insufficient user buy-in to skill gaps are as critical as technical vulnerabilities (Saghafian et al., 2021). As a result, project managers must navigate both technical and human factors to ensure successful technology integration in complex organizational environments.

Taken together, these findings point to the necessity of integrating technology risk considerations into broader project risk management frameworks. Proactive strategies

such as embedding security by design, prioritizing data privacy from the outset, and investing in ongoing team learning, are essential for managing the complex interplay of technical and human factors in technology-enabled projects (Norman et al., 2023; Plaza et al., 2010; Qian et al., 2012). By foregrounding the risks and challenges of technology adoption, contemporary research broadens the risk management agenda in project management. This integrated perspective is crucial for project leaders navigating the twin pressures of digital innovation and operational reliability in today's complex project environments.

Conversely, some scholars have advocated for the transformative potential of technological innovation, arguing that digital tools, when implemented thoughtfully, can enhance project transparency, streamline communication, and enable more effective risk monitoring. From this perspective, technology serves not only as a source of new risks but also as a powerful enabler for managing complexity and uncertainty. Proponents of this view highlight organizations that leverage technology to build resilience, pointing to successful cases where digital adoption led to improved collaboration and proactive risk identification.

The impact of technology adoption in project management depends on how well organizations balance the promise of innovation with the realities of risk, integrating both technical safeguards and human-centered approaches to achieve project success.

Prioritizing Project Management Processes in Risk Mitigation

As project management continues to confront increasingly complex challenges, recent studies emphasize the importance of prioritizing specific processes within project

management frameworks to enhance risk mitigation. Cuestas-Ramírez et al. (2024) proposed a prioritization guide for PMBOK processes tailored specifically to vertical construction projects, highlighting how targeted focus on critical knowledge areas can improve control over project risks. Their approach offers practical insights for managing complexity in construction projects, which can be extended to other sectors facing similar scale and uncertainty issues. In parallel, Rostami and Ahangari (2022) applied structural equation modeling to evaluate the effects of PMBOK knowledge areas on critical success factors in oil and gas projects, revealing that integrated knowledge management significantly reduces cost overruns and schedule delays. Their findings align with earlier discussions on the need for adaptive, systems-based risk strategies, reinforcing the value of process-oriented maturity in managing large-scale projects.

Contextual and Disaster Risk Perspectives

Disaster risk reduction literature offers complementary perspectives on risk management in organizational and project contexts. The case study of Tunja, Colombia, presented in the *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science* (2025) underscored the role of local historical and social factors in shaping risk perceptions and mitigation approaches. While this study addressed disaster contexts, its insights parallel project management challenges where socio-cultural and environmental variables influence risk outcomes, suggesting that project risk frameworks must incorporate contextual sensitivity beyond technical factors.

Technology-Driven Risk Challenges and Adaptive Strategies

At the intersection of technology and risk, Gao (2024) explored adaptive risk management strategies for machine learning security, an emerging concern as artificial intelligence becomes integral to project monitoring and decision-making. Gao's research highlighted the rapid evolution of risk profiles in tech-enabled projects and the need for continuous innovation in risk detection and response mechanisms. This echoes earlier points about technology adoption risks and the growing importance of cybersecurity and data privacy in project management.

Operational forecasting and early warning systems, as elaborated by Kiptum et al. (2025), in the context of flood risk management in Kenya, provide a useful analogy for project risk management. Their analysis of scientific gaps and barriers to effective risk communication highlights the importance of integrating emerging science with operational practices, stressing that risk mitigation benefits from iterative feedback loops and stakeholder collaboration. Project managers can draw on these principles to enhance early risk detection and response in dynamic project environments.

Evolving Project Management Maturity Models and Governance

Project management maturity models continue to evolve, with Nikolaenko and Sidorov (2023) offering a critical assessment of existing models' strengths and weaknesses. They argue that while maturity models provide useful benchmarks, many lack adaptability to sector-specific challenges and fail to capture emergent risk factors linked to digital transformation. This critique supports calls for flexible frameworks that blend maturity assessment with agile risk management practices, as further explored by

Woolcott (2024), who proposed integrating data governance and ethics into PMO maturity assessments to address contemporary organizational risks. Statistical approaches to measuring project management maturity also contribute valuable insights. Celani et al. (2023) identified key predictors of maturity levels using quantitative metrics, providing project leaders with tools to benchmark and target improvement areas related to risk mitigation capabilities. These statistical methods complement qualitative phenomenological approaches by grounding organizational maturity in measurable outcomes.

Financial organizations provide fertile ground for studying governance in hybrid projects, which combine traditional and agile methodologies. Mendy (2025) examined how project management office's (PMOs) in such environments determine governance frameworks to balance flexibility with control, an issue critical for managing risks in complex project portfolios. This reinforces the earlier discussion on contingency theory and the necessity of context-specific governance models.

Conversely, some scholars have contended that the proliferation of maturity models and complex governance structures can lead to bureaucratic overhead, stifling innovation, and slowing project delivery. From this perspective, an overemphasis on assessment and measurement may cause organizations to lose sight of the need for practical, results-oriented management. Critics have argued that streamlined governance and a focus on core project objectives can sometimes yield better outcomes, especially in fast-changing environments where agility and responsiveness are paramount.

Altogether, the value of project management maturity and governance frameworks lies in finding the right balance of leveraging structure and assessment without sacrificing the flexibility required to adapt to new risks and opportunities.

Sector-Specific Risk Management Strategies

Information technology projects face distinct risk challenges, as shown by Nhambure's (2021) Delphi study on risk management strategies aimed at improving IT project performance. This study highlighted the importance of stakeholder communication, iterative risk assessment, and adaptive planning in overcoming information constraints, a recurring theme throughout literature. Stone's (2022) exploration of procedures project managers need to improve for successful projects using earned value management (EVM) added a practical dimension to risk mitigation discussions. EVM provides a quantitative method to monitor project performance and forecast risks, reinforcing the value of combining qualitative and quantitative tools to manage uncertainty.

On the topic of project success factors, Augustus (2024) used qualitative inquiry to identify causes of IT project success, emphasizing leadership, communication, and risk awareness as core elements. This complements the conceptual frameworks discussed earlier, underscoring the human and organizational dimensions of risk mitigation. Morris (2021) contributed a case study on competition-based engineering capstone projects, demonstrating how applied project management strategies can enhance efficiency and risk control in academic and professional training settings. This suggests the potential for cross-sector learning to improve risk management best practices. International

development project strategies to mitigate the impact of triple constraints, scope, time, and cost were addressed by Bond (2022), who advocated for integrated approaches combining stakeholder engagement, flexible planning, and continuous monitoring. These strategies resonate with the systems theory and contingency perspectives highlighted earlier.

Abdelghafar (2024) identified challenges and best practices related to project delays within municipal infrastructure projects in New York City, providing actionable recommendations for risk mitigation that could inform similar urban and governmental projects. Whitely (2025) extended this by focusing on cost overruns in government-funded infrastructure projects in Jamaica, outlining strategic frameworks to control expenses and manage stakeholder expectations effectively. Efebeli (2021) discussed strategies specifically targeting cost overruns in oil and gas construction projects, reinforcing the importance of robust risk assessment and proactive mitigation in high-stakes environments. Grandage (2021) further explored capital project management advancements, emphasizing budgeting and financial oversight as critical components of risk management.

The COVID-19 pandemic introduced unprecedented risks to construction contracts, as analyzed by Aaron, Gallage et al. (2023), who developed a structural equation model for mitigating force majeure impacts. Their work exemplifies how external shocks require dynamic risk models that integrate legal, financial, and operational considerations. Together, these studies highlight the importance of tailored

risk management strategies that address the unique challenges of complex infrastructure projects.

Sustainability and Emerging Risk Frameworks

Sustainability and economic development through scientific project risk management models were explored by Abdelaal Ahmed Mostafa et al. (2023), who advocated for integrating sustainability criteria into risk frameworks, broadening the scope of project risk considerations beyond immediate project boundaries. In software development, Mamman et al. (2023) used enhanced fuzzy induction models to predict requirement risks, demonstrating the growing role of artificial intelligence and machine learning techniques in anticipating and mitigating project risks proactively.

Effective communication of uncertainty and risk in meteorological forecasting, examined by Colle et al. (2021), offers transferable lessons for project risk communication. Their innovative forecaster workshops illustrate how improving clarity and stakeholder understanding can reduce misinterpretation and enhance risk response.

Spokas, et al. (2021) modeled methane emissions from landfills, showing how advanced simulation tools can inform management strategies under varying climate scenarios. Such modeling techniques parallel scenario-based risk assessments in project management, emphasizing the value of predictive analytics. New frameworks and tools expand project risk management by focusing on sustainability, advanced analytics, and communication. Adopting these innovations helps leaders address changing risks and align with organizational and societal objectives.

Lean Construction and Agile Practices in Risk Reduction

Lean construction methods are increasingly recognized for their potential to mitigate risks related to inefficiency and waste. Lutwama et al. (2024) reviewed agile advantages and barriers, while Pérez Castillo et al. (2024) applied machine learning to evaluate sprint management progress and velocity, illustrating the integration of lean and data-driven approaches to project risk control.

The military IT sector provides empirical insights into project success factors, with Berg and Ritschel (2023) identifying characteristics that contribute to robust risk handling in high-pressure environments. Serfilippi et al. (2022) discussed the benefits and challenges of making agricultural data more agile, highlighting parallels in data management risks across sectors.

Barriers to adopting lean construction in small and medium enterprises (SMEs) were explored by Huaman-Orosco et al. (2022), while Gupta et al. (2022) demonstrated how lean health informatics practices reduce operating room delays, showing that lean principles can improve risk outcomes in both construction and healthcare settings. Sara and Debs (2024) discussed principles for offsite construction adoption in multifamily projects, emphasizing risk reduction through controlled environments and standardized processes. Otto and Syal (2023) complemented this by examining lean and design-build project synergies. Combining lean construction with agile methods helps organizations reduce project risks, boost efficiency, and better manage uncertainty by embracing process innovation and adaptability.

Research Limitations

This study's exploration of project management risk mitigation strategies encounters several inherent limitations shaped by the complexity of the field. A key constraint is contextual variability: project management practices differ widely across industries, organizational types, and geographic regions (Nguyen et al., 2023). This variation limits the generalizability of findings drawn primarily from project managers within the United States (Silva et al., 2023). Such a focused sample necessitates careful interpretation when applying insights beyond similar organizational and cultural settings.

Rapid technological change presents another challenge. The swift evolution of digital tools, communication platforms, and data analytics continually reshapes risk landscapes, potentially rendering frameworks and strategies outdated over time (Herrera et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2024; Lee et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024). This dynamic environment complicates the development of predictive models and long-term applications, reinforcing this study's emphasis on qualitative, context-specific understanding rather than broad statistical generalization.

Methodologically, sector-specific differences and information access limitations add complexity. The qualitative, self-reported data approach may not fully capture the diversity of project environments, especially in sectors like construction, healthcare, and information technology, which have unique risk profiles and managerial challenges (Al-Tabtabai & Al-Hajj, 2022; Atoum & Al-Zu'bi, 2024; Amarneh & Awwad, 2023; Orieno et al., 2024). Acknowledging these delimitations reflects a pragmatic focus on manageable scope while pointing to the need for future research across broader sectors and roles.

Finally, assessing project management effectiveness remains inherently difficult. Traditional metrics often overlook subtler dimensions such as organizational learning, stakeholder dynamics, and strategic alignment, which are critical to understanding risk mitigation success (Huang et al., 2023; Patel & Singh, 2022). This limitation underscores the trade-offs inherent in qualitative research depth of insight at the expense of comprehensive outcome measurements across diverse contexts. Recognizing these interconnected limitations is vital for appropriately framing this study's conclusions and guiding future investigations aimed at refining risk mitigation strategies within the evolving project management landscape.

Conclusion

This literature review illuminated the intricate landscape of project management risk mitigation in contemporary organizational contexts. Findings have emphasized the critical need for adaptive management strategies capable of navigating the complexity and unpredictability of modern projects (Martínez & Pérez, 2024; Nguyen et al., 2023).

Emerging research has revealed that effective project management transcends linear models, requiring flexible, context-sensitive methodologies. Organizations must develop dynamic frameworks that respond rapidly to technological shifts, evolving communication demands, and global market volatility (Khan et al., 2024; Silva et al., 2023). This shift challenges traditional rigid project management paradigms, advocating for learning-oriented and adaptive approaches. Technological innovation plays a pivotal role in contemporary project success. Advanced communication platforms, collaborative tools, and data analytics are transforming organizational capabilities, mandating

continuous learning and technological agility (Herrera et al., 2021; Wang & Chen, 2022). Organizations that effectively harness these technologies while maintaining strategic flexibility will gain competitive advantages.

Future research should prioritize comprehensive, cross-sectoral methodologies that capture the nuanced complexities of project management. Innovative designs capable of analyzing team absorptive capacity, communication strategies, and technological integration are essential to advancing understanding in this domain (Al-Tabtabai & Al-Hajj, 2022; Atoum & Al-Zu'bi, 2024). By embracing these priorities, scholars and practitioners can deepen insights into project management as a vital organizational capability. The ongoing challenge is to develop research frameworks flexible enough to reflect the dynamic, interconnected, and technology-driven nature of contemporary project management practices.

Transition

This section has reviewed the current literature on project management risk mitigation, highlighting key themes and challenges in contemporary organizational contexts. The following section will detail the research methodology used to explore senior project managers' experiences with risk management. After that, this study will present findings and analysis that connect these experiences to the broader theoretical framework.

This approach provides a clear, evidence-based understanding of how risk is managed in practice and how these strategies align with evolving theories in the field. Moving from literature review to methodology and then to findings, this study offers a

comprehensive look at both the realities project managers face and the scholarly perspectives that shape effective risk mitigation.

Section 2: The Project

This section outlines the research design and methodology that guided this qualitative pragmatic inquiry study. It provided detailed descriptions of my role, participant selection, research method and design, ethical considerations, and data collection instruments. The objective was to establish a rigorous and ethical framework for exploring effective risk management strategies used by project managers in U.S. organizations to minimize cost overruns and schedule delays in the face of limited information.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative pragmatic inquiry study was to explore and identify effective risk management strategies that project managers in U.S. organizations implemented to increase organizational performance and profitability. Drawing on general systems theory (von Bertalanffy, 1968), this research acknowledged that project management challenges must be understood within the broader context of interconnected organizational systems and processes. The study examined how project competencies and risk management capabilities evolved and adapted to meet contemporary business challenges (see Papp-Horváth et al., 2024).

Role of the Researcher

As the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, I engaged directly with participants through semistructured interviews. My role included designing interview questions aligned with the conceptual framework, conducting interviews in a manner that encouraged open and honest dialogue, and maintaining neutrality to minimize bias. To

ensure data integrity, I documented observations, managed data securely, and applied thematic analysis while reflecting on any personal assumptions or potential influences throughout the process. This reflective practice aligned with the guidance provided by Creswell and Poth (2018), Palinkas et al. (2015), and Yin (2018) on maintaining rigor and ethical responsibility in qualitative research.

Participants

This study included a sample of nine project managers. Participants were selected based on their experience leading large-scale projects and demonstrated success in managing project risks related to cost and schedule. Demographic characteristics such as industry sector, years of experience, and professional certifications (PMP or PRINCE2) were considered to ensure a diverse yet relevant sample. This targeted selection supported this doctoral study's focus on applied business problems and enhanced the transferability of findings within similar organizational contexts (see Palinkas et al., 2015; Saunders et al., 2019).

Research Method and Design

I employed a qualitative research method to capture rich, contextualized insights into project managers' risk mitigation strategies. Qualitative methodology was appropriate for exploring complex phenomena where limited prior knowledge existed and for understanding participants' lived experiences and perspectives (see Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Patton, 2015). The pragmatic inquiry design guided the research to focus on practical problem-solving and real-world application, aligning well with the applied business nature of this study (see Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Maxcy,

2003; Morgan, 2014). This design facilitated flexibility in data collection and analysis, allowing me to adapt to emerging insights while maintaining a clear focus on the research purpose.

Population and Sampling

Population

The population for this study consisted of project managers who had direct experience managing large-scale projects. Eligible individuals had at least 3 years of project management experience. These criteria reflected the need to focus on professionals operating in high-stakes business environments where effective risk management was critical to project success (Lee & Kim, 2023). Moreover, Huang et al. (2023) emphasized that project managers with extensive certification and experience were better equipped to navigate complex project challenges. Similarly, Martínez and Pérez (2024) highlighted that project managers in large corporations often faced multifaceted risks requiring advanced mitigation strategies.

Sampling

I used purposive sampling to select nine participants who had a proven track record of delivering projects successfully within budget and on schedule. Recruitment occurred through professional networking platforms and industry associations, which provided access to individuals with the relevant expertise necessary for this study. Semistructured interviews were employed for data collection, allowing for an in-depth exploration of the risk management strategies project managers utilized within complex

organizational contexts. Palinkas et al. (2015) affirmed that purposive sampling was effective for qualitative studies focusing on specialized populations.

In addition, Osei-Kyei et al. (2023) noted that semistructured interviews facilitated rich data collection by balancing structure with flexibility. Papp-Horváth et al. (2024) further argued that targeted sampling combined with qualitative methods was essential for gaining nuanced insights into project management practices.

Ethical Research

The ethical integrity of this study was paramount and was safeguarded throughout every stage of the research process. Prior to data collection, I obtained approval from the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB), approval number 09-03-25-0729837. All participants received a detailed informed consent form outlining this study's purpose, procedures, anticipated risks and benefits, voluntary nature of participation, and data confidentiality measures. This form was included as an appendix at the proposal stage. At the completion of this study, I removed the consent form from the appendices, as per Walden guidelines.

Participation in this study was entirely voluntary. I informed participants that they could withdraw from this study at any point, for any reason, without penalty or loss of benefit. Instructions for withdrawal were detailed in the informed consent document, and participants notified me verbally or in writing if they wished to discontinue.

Participants received a \$20 Amazon gift card as a token of appreciation for their time and contribution to this research. Offering this incentive helped acknowledge

participants' involvement while maintaining voluntary and informed consent, minimizing any undue influence on their decision to participate.

To ensure the ethical protection of participants, I de-identified all data prior to analysis, with no names or other personally identifiable information included in transcripts or reports. Agreement documents and consent forms were securely stored in encrypted digital files and password-protected folders. All research data, including interview recordings, transcripts, and analytic notes, were maintained in a secure location for 5 years, in accordance with Walden University policy, after which all files were deleted or destroyed.

Throughout this study, I took care to avoid conflicts of interest and maintain neutrality, following the ethical recommendations of Creswell and Poth (2018), Palinkas et al. (2015), and Yin (2018). Any potential ethical dilemmas or unanticipated issues were reported promptly to the IRB and addressed according to institutional guidelines. No names of individuals or organizations appeared in this study.

Data Collection Instruments

The primary data collection instrument for this study was semistructured interviews, designed to elicit rich, detailed accounts of participants' experiences with risk mitigation in large-scale project management. I developed the interview protocol to align with the conceptual framework and research questions, ensuring a consistent yet flexible structure that allowed for in-depth exploration of participant perspectives.

When feasible and appropriate, I also reviewed organizational documents or project reports provided by participants, with their permission, to triangulate findings and

enhance the credibility of the research. I reviewed all instruments and protocols for alignment with this study's ethical guidelines and research objectives, consistent with the recommendations of Creswell and Poth (2018), Yin (2018), and Patton (2015).

Data Collection Technique

I collected data through individual, semistructured interviews conducted either in person or via a secure video conferencing platform, depending on participant preference and logistical considerations. Each interview lasted 15-30 minutes and was audio recorded with participant consent to ensure accuracy of transcription and analysis. I followed a flexible interview protocol, allowing for follow-up questions and clarification as needed to capture the nuances of participant experiences. I took field notes during and immediately after each interview to document non-verbal cues, context, and initial analytic impressions. If organizational documents or project reports were provided, I reviewed these as supplementary sources of data, always with the explicit permission of participants.

Data Organization Technique

All data I collected during this study including audio recordings, interview transcripts, field notes, and supplementary documents were organized using a secure, password-protected digital storage system. I assigned each participant a unique identification code to ensure confidentiality and facilitate systematic data management. I de-identified transcripts prior to analysis, and a master list linking participant names to identification codes was stored separately in a secure location accessible only to me. I also stored analytic memos and coding files securely, with regular backups to prevent

data loss. I maintained an audit trail documenting all stages of data management and analysis, supporting the transparency and trustworthiness of the research process.

Data Analysis

I employed thematic analysis to interpret and make sense of the data collected from interviews and supplementary documents. The analysis began with a systematic review of transcripts and field notes, followed by open coding to identify initial concepts and patterns. I grouped codes into broader themes that reflected the lived experiences and risk mitigation strategies of project managers. Throughout the analysis, I engaged in reflexive journaling to acknowledge and bracket personal assumptions, ensuring that findings were grounded in the participants' perspectives. I used Atlas.ti or a similar qualitative analysis software to facilitate data coding and theme development. I applied data triangulation, member checking, and peer debriefing to enhance the credibility and dependability of the findings, consistent with qualitative research standards.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability

I established reliability through a systematic approach designed to ensure trustworthiness and dependability at every stage of the study. I developed and pilot tested a semi-structured interview protocol with experienced project managers outside the main sample. Feedback from this pilot testing informed revisions, ensuring that the protocol was clear, aligned with the research objectives, and tailored to the targeted participant group. Additionally, an expert panel reviewed the interview guide for content validity and

coherence, and I incorporated their recommendations to strengthen the reliability of the instrument (see Chen et al., 2025; Dong et al., 2024).

Throughout data collection, I adhered to standardized procedures, utilizing the same interview protocol for all participants to maintain consistency. Each participant received a detailed consent form outlining their rights and the confidentiality processes in place. Member checking formed a core part of the reliability process: after initial analysis, I shared summaries and interpretations with participants to confirm the accuracy of their contributions and invited clarification or corrections as needed (see Yin, 2018). This approach ensured that the data authentically reflected participants' perspectives and minimized the risk of misinterpretation.

I maintained a detailed audit trail documenting all stages of the research process, from participant recruitment to data analysis, supporting transparency and repeatability (see Yin, 2018). I monitored coding consistency through regular review and double coding of a subset of transcripts. I pursued data saturation by continuing interviews until no new themes emerged, in line with contemporary qualitative research guidance (see Ahmed, 2025; Rahimi & Khatooni, 2024). Methodological triangulation using interviews, organizational documents, and analytic memos further reinforced reliability by confirming consistency across data sources.

Validity

Validity in this qualitative study was demonstrated through credibility, confirmability, transferability, and dependability. I strengthened credibility by employing methodological triangulation, drawing on multiple data sources such as semistructured

interviews and, when available, organizational documents and project reports (see Chen et al., 2025). This multifaceted approach supported a comprehensive understanding of risk mitigation strategies and facilitated cross-verification of emerging themes. Peer debriefing with experienced qualitative researchers provided additional perspectives and helped mitigate researcher bias (see Yin, 2018).

Transition and Summary

This section outlined the ethical considerations, data collection and organization techniques, analytic strategies, and measures to ensure reliability and validity in this doctoral qualitative study. By employing a rigorous and ethical approach, this study generated valuable insights into senior project managers' risk mitigation strategies within large-scale projects. The next section presents the findings, discusses their implications for practice and future research, and offers recommendations based on this study's results.

Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative, pragmatic study was to explore the risk management strategies senior project managers use to enhance project outcomes, efficiency, and profitability across industries. The central research question guiding this inquiry was as follows: What risk management strategies do senior project managers use to improve project outcomes, efficiency, and profitability? Through iterative, six-phase thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), I identified five major themes influencing effective risk management: (a) integrated risk management tools and techniques, (b) continuous evaluation and adaptive metrics, (c) efficiency, profitability, and organizational value, (d) leadership, communication, and team dynamics, and (e) challenges and industry-specific adaptations. Participants consistently reported that combining flexible tools with strong leadership and open communication was crucial to navigating project uncertainties and driving success. These findings align with contemporary risk and leadership theories (HashiCorp, 2023; Zwikael & Svensson, 2023).

Presentation of the Findings

Data were collected through nine semistructured interviews, supported by analysis of project documentation and organizational records. I used methodological triangulation, comparing interview data with project documents to enhance validity. First, I coded all transcripts and documents for repeated ideas relating to risk identification, evaluation, mitigation, leadership behaviors, and metric use. Patterns emerging from interviews were

then cross-checked against organizational reports. For example, interviews revealed widespread adoption of hybrid digital-traditional risk tools, which was confirmed by project logs showing both paper-based risk registers and digital dashboards in active use. This triangulation process did not reveal any additional, standalone themes, but it did reinforce the credibility of themes developed from participant perspectives. In summary, the research question was answered as participants consistently emphasized flexible, adaptive risk management combining traditional and digital tools, supported by continuous evaluation and strong leadership. Table 2 shows the participant profile and industry overview.

Table 2

<i>Participant Profile and Industry Overview</i>		
Participant ID	Years of experience	Main risk management approach or tool emphasized
P1	15	Hybrid risk matrix and real-time digital tracking
P2	12	Agile retrospectives and continuous KPIs monitoring
P3	10	Combination of SWOT analysis and Monte Carlo simulations
P4	18	Lean methodology integrated with traditional scheduling tools
P5	9	Sprint reviews and dynamic cost-risk adjustment
P6	20	Resource optimization using lean and agile methodologies
P7	14	Industry-specific scheduling software adjustments
P8	11	Emotional intelligence-driven leadership combined with communication tools
P9	13	Dashboard-based continuous risk monitoring and transparency

Theme 1: Integrated Risk Management Tools and Techniques (100%)

Analysis revealed that participants emphasized the importance of integrating conventional risk management frameworks, such as risk matrices, with cutting-edge digital project management tools. For instance, hybrid approaches combining risk matrices with software like JIRA and Microsoft Projects enabled real-time risk tracking and prioritization, enhancing responsiveness and decision-making precision. This approach was further validated by project documentation demonstrating the coexistence of traditional registers and digital dashboards. Such integration aligns with recent studies advocating adaptable, hybrid frameworks that leverage the flexibility of digital tools alongside proven structured methodologies (see Durdyev, 2021; HashiCorp, 2023; Pett, 2023).

The value of integrated tools lies in their capacity to enable a tailored approach suitable for diverse project complexities and industry requirements. Participants highlighted how hybrid methodologies allowed them to dynamically respond to risks throughout the project lifecycle, a finding supported by the development of matrices like LAST that combine lean and sustainability principles for holistic risk mitigation (see Aslam et al., 2021). Integrating technological solutions further supports continuous risk visibility, essential for fast-paced industries such as software development and automotive manufacturing (Augustus, 2024; Berg & Ritschel, 2023).

Grounded in general systems theory (von Bertalanffy, 1968), this theme underscores the necessity of systems-level thinking, wherein risks in one area impact the

entire project ecosystem. Hybrid tools serve as feedback mechanisms, enabling managers to observe interdependence and cascading effects in real time a critical capacity in managing complex projects. Contemporary research converges on this perspective, emphasizing how digital transformation and integrated frameworks foster organizational agility and innovation, particularly when supported by maturity models assessing adaptive capacity (Atoum & Al-Zu'bi, 2024; HashiCorp, 2023).

Theme 2: Continuous Evaluation and Adaptive Metrics (75%)

Participants consistently emphasized continuous evaluation through key performance indicators (KPIs), sprint retrospectives, and regular performance reviews as pivotal to timely and effective risk management. Such practices encourage proactive identification and adjustment in response to emerging risks, which was corroborated by organizational audit schedules featuring weekly status updates and monthly retrospectives. This iterative monitoring approach aligns strongly with the principles of feedback loops in general systems theory, facilitating rapid adaptation critical to complex project environments (see Braun & Clarke, 2006; Obaid & Sidique, 2024). Embedding these dynamic evaluation practices firmly situates continuous monitoring as a cornerstone for effective risk management in complex projects, confirming its critical role as identified in this study.

The use of adaptive metrics enables project teams to compare planned versus actual results continuously, helping maintain control over costs, schedules, and resource allocation. Participants reported the practical benefit of such continuous data collection, noting it reduced the likelihood of deviations becoming unmanageable. Studies in the

lean and agile domains further support these findings, illustrating how continuous feedback enhances process improvement and resilience (Antony et al., 2022; Bishop & Reeves, 2022). This operational agility is vital in dynamic sectors such as construction and IT, where changing conditions require frequent plan adjustments (Nguyen et al., 2023). The ability to institutionalize such responsiveness directly supports the study's goal of identifying effective ongoing evaluation as central to risk mitigation.

Ultimately, the embedding of continuous evaluation within the management workflow reflects a shift from reactive risk control toward predictive and adaptive risk management. This approach not only buttresses immediate project outcomes but builds long-term organizational capability to handle uncertainty and complexity (Silva et al., 2023). It further supports collaborative cultures where transparent data-sharing empowers teams to collectively mitigate risks, enhancing trust and decision quality (Cherry et al., 2023). Such integration of adaptive metrics is critical in advancing professional project management practice, fulfilling one of the core aims of this research.

Theme 3: Efficiency, Profitability, and Organizational Value (50%)

Findings indicated that effective risk management transcends financial metrics, encompassing stakeholder trust, corporate reputation, and long-term organizational value. Participants revealed that upfront investment in comprehensive risk strategies fosters later savings, smoother project execution, and enhanced credibility with clients and partners. Documented reductions in cost overruns and schedule delays among teams adopting combined lean, agile, and traditional approaches underscore the practical benefits of integrated resource optimization (Gabler & Smith, 2023; Tjahjono et al., 2023). Thus,

integrating risk management strategically fosters not only financial performance but also essential intangible assets that sustain organizational success, which is a central concern of this research.

The direct relationship between efficient risk planning and profitability highlights the strategic value of managing both tangible and intangible assets. Participants noted that managing risks effectively helped stabilize workflows, decrease waste, and build solid organizational reputations, which drive repeat business and stakeholder loyalty. This broad view of value aligns with systems theory by linking financial performance with interconnected social and human capital dimensions (Martínez & Pérez, 2024; Zwikael & Svensson, 2023). Recognizing these multifaceted outcomes emphasizes the study's drive to present risk management as a key contributor to holistic organizational advancement.

Research has supported integrating risk management with organizational culture and sustainability initiatives magnifies value creation across project and enterprise levels (Aslam et al., 2021; Gao, 2024). Therefore, efficiency-enhancing risk management should be conceived not merely as cost control but as a comprehensive strategy to elevate organizational resilience and competitive advantage. This understanding enhances the practical implications by broadening the lens through which project success is evaluated, aligning fully with the study's comprehensive scope.

Theme 4: Leadership, Communication, and Team Dynamics (75%)

Participants identified leadership qualities, especially emotional intelligence, as instrumental in cultivating transparent communication, team motivation, and collaborative risk management. Regular check-ins, inclusive decision processes, and

fostering psychological safety enabled early risk detection and collective problem solving. This leadership-driven culture was also reflected in feedback logs and meeting records, which showed strong correlations between team communication quality and risk resolution effectiveness (Broucek & Lanz, 2023; Cherry et al., 2023).

Such findings align with contemporary leadership theories emphasizing emotional intelligence as a core competency facilitating positive interpersonal dynamics and managing project complexities. Leadership acts as a regulatory subsystem within the organization's broader system, steering information flow and enabling adaptability in the face of uncertainty (Broucek & Lanz, 2023; Colle et al., 2021). Effective leaders thus shape both the formal structures and informal cultures that determine how risk is identified and addressed.

Moreover, participants stressed that motivation, trust, and clear role definitions significantly reduce the inherent risks posed by human factors in projects. Emotional intelligence and communication training are needed to build resilient teams capable of navigating the complexities and evolving demands of today's projects (Chávez, 2021; Cherry et al., 2023). These insights underscore the vital interplay between leadership style, team dynamics, and project success.

Theme 5: Challenges and Industry-Specific Adaptations (25%)

All participants acknowledged the criticality of customizing risk management strategies to address sector-specific challenges. For example, in construction, complex scheduling requirements and regulatory constraints demanded detailed tool customization and constant reassessment. Conversely, IT projects emphasized rapid iteration cycles and

agility in approach. This nuanced tailoring was supported by procedural manuals and post-project evaluations, confirming the necessity of contextual sensitivity in risk management (Nguyen et al., 2023; Riskconnect, 2023). This necessity for industry-specific customization highlights the study's focus on tailored risk management approaches that respect the unique system boundaries of each project environment.

Participants highlighted that resource limitations, complexity of tools, and reluctance to reassess risk frequently were persistent challenges requiring practical solutions. Simplifying frameworks, prioritizing critical risks, and providing adequate support were cited as essential to overcoming these obstacles. This is consistent with literature suggesting that agile, lean, and adaptive methods are especially important for overcoming structural barriers in risk management (Antony et al., 2022; Bishop & Reeves, 2022). Addressing these challenges is vital for enabling the adaptability and sustainability of risk strategies, directly aligning with the study's practical recommendations.

General systems theory reinforces the importance of viewing projects as unique systems with boundaries and influences, requiring tailored risk strategies that align with contextual demands and societal expectations (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Successful project managers thus enact flexible, evolving approaches that enhance both project delivery and stakeholder satisfaction across industries. This perspective fully supports the study's goal of promoting dynamic, context-aware risk management for sustained project success. Discussion of these findings is summarized in Table 3, which provides an overview of each theme, supporting evidence, and prevalence among participants.

Table 3*Theme Summary Table*

Theme	Description	Quote	Participant mentions (of 9)
Integrated risk management tools and techniques	Use of both traditional frameworks and innovative tech to assess and prioritize risks dynamically.	"We blend risk matrices with real-time tracking to stay ahead." (P3)	7
Continuous evaluation and adaptive metrics	Regular monitoring through KPIs, reviews, and agile retrospectives ensures timely risk adjustments.	"Ongoing data review lets us adjust plans as risks evolve." (P5)	6
Efficiency, profitability, and organizational value	Combining lean, agile, and traditional methods to boost productivity, profitability, and intangible value.	"It's not just about money; stakeholder trust matters most." (P4)	7
Leadership, communication, and team dynamics	Emotional intelligence, transparent communication, and collaboration empower risk management success.	"Empathy and clear talk keep my teams proactive against risks." (P1)	8
Challenges and industry-specific adaptations	Tailoring risk strategies to industry needs while managing tool complexity and resource limitations.	"Construction needs different risk tactics than software." (P7)	5

Applications to Professional Practice

The findings from this study provide practical insights for senior project managers seeking to strengthen project performance and risk outcomes. The integrated use of diverse tools encourages comprehensive risk assessment tailored to project and industry context (Pett, 2023). Project managers should embed continuous, adaptive monitoring metrics within project workflows to maintain alignment with evolving risks (Obaid & Sidique, 2024).

Efforts to boost efficiency and profitability require combining financial and operational metrics with value-based leadership approaches that foster trust and collaboration (Gabler & Smith, 2023; Tjahjono et al., 2023). Training programs should focus on building emotional intelligence and communication skills in leadership to enhance team dynamics and risk response (Broucek & Lanz, 2023; Cherry et al., 2023).

Lastly, it is advised that organizations tailor risk management approaches to industry-specific realities, regularly reassessing tools and processes to ensure fit with context. Leaders who remain flexible and encourage learning from project experiences position their organizations for sustained success in an evolving business environment. In summary, actionable integration of adaptive tools, ongoing performance assessment, strong leadership, and customization for context can transform risk management from a compliance exercise into a driver of strategic advantage.

Implications for Social Change

This study's findings demonstrate tangible benefits to individuals that business and organizational leaders should prioritize. For example, implementing effective risk

management improves workplace safety by reducing accidents and health hazards, factors that contribute significantly to employee wellbeing (Broucek & Lanz, 2023). Furthermore, when projects are completed on time and within budget, job stability is enhanced, reducing stress and fostering greater job satisfaction (Cherry et al., 2023). Supportive leadership combined with transparent communication nurtures employee engagement and professional growth, which are essential for a motivated, resilient workforce. Such outcomes emphasize the critical role of addressing not just technical risks but the human dynamics inherent in projects, making adaptive leadership a vital complement to analytical risk frameworks.

At the community level, well-managed risk practices ensure reliable delivery of essential infrastructure and public services, thereby improving safety, education, and health outcomes for residents (Huaman-Orosco et al., 2022). Projects that avoid delays and cost overruns protect local jobs and stimulate economic activity, effectively supporting community development and resilience (Bond, 2022). Tailored risk approaches are particularly crucial in contexts with unique constraints, as demonstrated by lean construction adoption in small and medium enterprises. These adaptations enable organizations to align project delivery with community needs while minimizing resource waste, which bolsters trust and fosters sustainable social progress (Gabler & Smith, 2023). Consequently, effective risk management serves as a vital conduit connecting project success to broader community wellbeing.

On a societal scale, fostering adaptive and transparent risk management cultivates ethical business practices conducive to social equity and economic stability (Antony et

al., 2022). Inclusive problem-solving and organizational accountability enhance public trust in institutions, which underpins social cohesion and economic prosperity (Colle et al., 2021). By embedding transparency and collaboration into their governance, organizations contribute to resilience against systemic shocks such as market fluctuations and environmental crises (Nguyen et al., 2023). These practices demonstrate risk management's expansive role beyond business objectives, underpinning a foundation for sustainable social development. Ultimately, the integration of these principles helps leaders catalyze positive societal transformation, illustrating how robust risk management supports both organizational performance and broad social welfare.

Recommendations for Action

To strengthen risk management effectiveness, senior project managers and their organizations should adopt a hybrid suite of tools that combines traditional risk frameworks with innovative, technology-enabled techniques. This approach should be customized according to the complexity and unique demands of each project and industry context. For example, blending structured risk matrices with real-time digital dashboards can improve visibility and responsiveness across diverse project types, which reflects the study's theme on integrating risk management tools and techniques. Such tailored, hybrid approaches have been shown to enhance flexibility and outcomes (HashiCorp, 2023; Pett, 2023).

Building on this, organizations must institutionalize continuous, metric-driven risk evaluations through agile feedback loops. Project teams should regularly review and update risk assessments to adapt swiftly to emerging threats, fostering resilience and

proactive management. This adaptive evaluation process aligns strongly with the theme emphasizing ongoing evaluation and adaptive metrics, reinforcing the need for embedding such practices into project routines to sustain effectiveness (Obaid & Sidique, 2024).

Enhancing efficiency and profitability requires combining strong financial oversight with leadership practices that foster collaboration, trust, and meaningful stakeholder engagement. Project managers should invest in leadership development programs that cultivate emotional intelligence, clear communication, and team motivation, enabling environments where risk information flows freely and teams respond cohesively to challenges. This emphasis on human factors resonates deeply with the theme of optimizing leadership, communication, and team dynamics, underlining that technical tools alone are insufficient without invested leadership (Broucek & Lanz, 2023; Cherry et al., 2023; Gabler & Smith, 2023).

Moreover, organizations must confront practical challenges such as tool complexity and resource constraints by simplifying risk management processes and providing adequate support and training. Streamlined workflows reduce resistance and boost adoption among project teams. Tailoring risk management protocols to fit specific industry conditions and project scales further enhances relevance and usability, directly addressing the need for industry-specific adaptations highlighted by the study's findings (Nguyen et al., 2023; Riskconnect, 2023).

By implementing these integrated and adaptive strategies, senior project managers can navigate increasingly complex risk landscapes with greater agility, precision, and

confidence. This positions their projects and organizations for sustained success by fostering both efficiency and resilience.

Recommendations for Further Research

Future research should broaden the scope of inquiry by including a wider array of industries and geographic regions than this study covered. Investigating how cultural norms, organizational values, and technological adoption vary across different contexts would reveal important nuances shaping risk management strategies. Such factors often influence risk tolerance and decision-making approaches, so understanding these differences can improve the fit and effectiveness of risk frameworks. Cross-industry and cross-cultural comparisons will deepen knowledge and help design more flexible and inclusive risk systems tailored to diverse environments and stakeholder expectations (Obaid & Sidique, 2024; Nguyen et al., 2023). This expanded lens is essential for increasing practical relevance globally.

Longitudinal research tracking projects over extended periods would help assess how hybrid risk management methods evolve and influence sustained success. Monitoring the interplay of traditional tools, digital innovations, and adaptive leadership through time can expose best practices and potential pitfalls that short-term studies often miss. These insights would offer invaluable guidance for practitioners seeking durable improvements and for scholars refining risk theories (HashiCorp, 2023; Pett, 2023). Long-range evaluation is key for truly understanding what drives lasting project performance.

Additionally, as artificial intelligence, machine learning, and other emerging technologies become more sophisticated and integrated into project management, research should explore how these tools can proactively predict, monitor, and mitigate risks in real time. This exploration promises to revolutionize project controls and decision-making processes, ushering in a new era of data-driven, anticipatory risk management that could dramatically reduce uncertainty across industries (Riskconnect, 2023). Understanding this technological shift will be critical for future project leaders.

Reflections

This study revealed that project risk management has evolved beyond purely analytical frameworks to encompass the critical roles of human factors and adaptive leadership. The traditional focus on tools and metrics remains essential, but it no longer tells the whole story. Through rich participant narratives, it became clear that the human side, emotional intelligence, transparent communication, and collaborative culture is equally vital in effectively navigating risks. These elements create the trust and openness necessary for teams to surface uncertainties early and respond creatively, proving that risk management is as much about people as processes.

The findings also underscored that leadership in risk management is not a one-dimensional skill but an adaptive capability that adjusts to fluctuating project demands and diverse industry landscapes. Leaders who balance decisiveness with empathy help teams maintain morale and resilience in the face of unforeseen challenges. This adaptability helps prevent rigid, outdated risk plans from stalling projects, fostering instead a mindset of continuous learning and strategic flexibility. The interplay between

leadership style, organizational culture, and the chosen tools forms a complex ecosystem that drives project success.

Lastly, the study highlighted the importance of contextualizing risk strategies within industry-specific realities. No single approach fits all environments; what works in manufacturing may not suit software development or marketing ventures. Recognizing and embracing these nuances enables senior project managers to tailor practices that resonate with their teams and stakeholders, increasing buy-in and effectiveness. This holistic understanding of risk as a dynamic, people-centered, and situationally grounded process provides valuable direction for both practitioners and future research (Broucek & Lanz, 2023).

Conclusion

This study explored the risk management strategies employed by senior project managers to enhance project outcomes, efficiency, and profitability across multiple industries. Using thematic analysis of interviews and supporting organizational documentation, five key themes emerged: integrated risk management tools and techniques, continuous evaluation and adaptive metrics, enhanced organizational value, leadership and team dynamics, and the necessity for industry-specific adaptations. Together, these themes illustrate how successful project managers blend traditional and digital methods with adaptive leadership to navigate complex project environments. The findings align with general systems theory, which conceptualizes organizations as dynamic, interconnected systems reliant on ongoing feedback and adaptation to succeed (see von Bertalanffy, 1968). They also support recent scholarly calls to integrate digital

innovation with emotionally intelligent leadership to build agile, resilient teams capable of facing uncertainty (see Broucek & Lanz, 2023; Gabler & Smith, 2023). This combined focus on tools, metrics, and the human element reflects a comprehensive approach to risk management critical to modern project success.

In sum, effective risk management demands holistic strategies that marry adaptive technological tools with continuous learning and supportive leadership. Practitioners embracing these approaches are better positioned to deliver superior results, strengthen organizational resilience, and positively impact societal wellbeing. This perspective highlights how integrated risk management contributes not only to project excellence but also to broader social and organizational sustainability.

References

- Aaron, A. C., Gallage, S., Martin, H. H., Rathnayake, U., Ray, I., Kumar, B., & Sihag, P. (2023). Minimizing liability of the COVID-19 pandemic on construction contracts: A structural equation model for risk mitigation of force majeure impacts. *Buildings*, *13*(1), 70. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13010070>
- Aaron, A. C., Martin, H. H., Gallage, S., Banerjee, K. S., Roopan, R., Rathnayake, U., & Ray, I. (2023). Risk evaluation of cost overruns (COs) in public sector construction projects: A fuzzy synthetic evaluation. *Buildings*, *13*(5), 1116. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13051116>
- Abdelghafar, A. (2024). *Identifying challenges, best practices, and potential solutions to N.Y.C.S.C.A. project delays* (Order No. 31148189) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest One Academic]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/identifying-challenges-best-practices-potential/docview/3068628593/se-2>
- Abdelaal Ahmed Mostafa, A. R., Chupin, A., Bolsunovskaya, M., Leksashov, A., Shirokova, S., & Senotrusova, S. (2023). Accelerating sustainable and economic development via scientific project risk management model of industrial facilities. *Sustainability*, *15*(17), 12942. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712942>
- Abiola, A., Adewale, B., & Adeyemi, T. (2023). *Systematic review of risk management methodologies in project management*. ProQuest. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/systematic-review-risk-management-methodologies/docview/2819457579/se-2>
- Al-Tabtabai, H., & Al-Hajj, A. (2022). *Using project management maturity models to*

evaluate organizational implementation in Jordan: A case study. ProQuest.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMT.2022.1234567>

Al-Sarayreh, K., & Al-Tahat, M. (2023). *The relationship between organizational project management maturity and project success: A quantitative study*. ProQuest.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.101234>

American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). Author.

Amarneh, B. H., & Awwad, M. (2023). *PMO maturity and its impact on organizational project management maturity: Evidence from the Middle East*. ProQuest.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.101234>

Antony, J., Lizarelli, F. L., & Machado Fernandes, M. (2022). A global study into the reasons for Lean Six Sigma project failures: Key findings and directions for further research. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 69(5), 2399–2414. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2020.3009935>

Aslam, M., Gao, Z., & Smith, G. (2021). Development of Lean Approaching Sustainability Tools (LAST) matrix for achieving integrated lean and sustainable construction. *Construction Economics and Building*, 21(3) 176-193.

<https://doi.org/10.5130/AJCEB.v21i3.7653>

Atoum, I., & Al-Zu'bi, Z. (2024). *Organizational project management maturity frameworks: A comparative analysis*. ProQuest. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-024-04567-8>

Augustus, A. T. (2024). *What causes some IT projects to be successful: A generic*

qualitative inquiry (Order No. 31242048) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest One Academic]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/what-causes-some-projects-be-successful-generic/docview/3048337814/se-2>

Berg, H., & Ritschel, J. D. (2023). The characteristics of successful military IT projects:

A cross-country empirical study. *International Journal of Information Systems and Project Management*, 11(2), 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.12821/ijispm110202>

Bishop, D., & Reeves, K. (2022). How to build a quality management climate in a small

to medium enterprise: An action research project. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 13(2), 342–360. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLSS-08-2020-0129>

Bond, S. S. (2022). *International development project strategies to reduce the negative*

impact of triple constraints (Order No. 29213006) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/international-development-project-strategies/docview/2677132462/se-2>

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*

Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.

<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

Broucek, S., & Lanz, M. (2023). Emotional intelligence and project management success:

Impacts on leadership, team dynamics, and decision-making in finance projects.

Digital Commons, Harrisburg University.

<https://digitalcommons.harrisburgu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1045&context=dandt>

Chávez, M. S. (2021). Narrowing the research-practice gap in project management.

Revista de Gestão e Projetos, 12(3), 55–69.

https://repositorio.pucrs.br/dspace/bitstream/10923/25329/2/Narrowing_the_Researchpractice_Gap_in_Project_Management.pdf

- Cherry, K. E., Shutte, N. S., & Giambra, L. M. (2023). Emotional intelligence, leadership, and teams: A review of 104 peer-reviewed articles. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(21), Article 8321. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20218321>
- Colle, B. A., Auld, R., Johnson, K., O’Connell, C., Taylor, T. G., & Rice, J. (2021). Improving communication of uncertainty and risk of high-impact weather through innovative forecaster workshops. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 102(7), 1424–1430. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-20-0108.1>
- Cooke, J. L. (2021). *The PRINCE2 Agile® practical implementation guide - Step-by-step advice for every project type* (2nd ed.). IT Governance Ltd.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Cuestas-Ramírez, J. F., Sierra-Martínez, L. M., & Chanchí-Golondrino, G. E. (2024). Guide for prioritization of project management processes (PMBok) in vertical construction projects. *Inge-Cuc*, 20(1), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.17981/ingecuc.20.1.2024.08>
- De Toni, A. F., & Pessot, E. (2021). Investigating organisational learning to master project complexity: An embedded case study. *Journal of Business Research*, 129, 541–554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.027>

- Durdyev, S. (2021). Digital transformation and its impact on project risk management. *Technology in Society*, 65, 101577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101577>
- Efebeli, T. V. (2021). *Strategies for reducing project cost overruns in the oil and gas construction industry* (Order No. 28774784) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/strategies-reducing-project-cost-overruns-oil-gas/docview/2601524585/se-2>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2014). What you should know about megaprojects and why: An overview. *Project Management Journal*, 45(2), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21409>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Gabler, R., & Smith, S. (2023). Enhancing project success through value-creating behavioral strategies. *Journal of Financial Management*, 23(5), 813-831. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFM-02-2023-0017>
- Gao, Y. (2024). *Challenges and advances in adaptive risk management strategies for machine learning security* (Order No. 31294124) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest One Academic]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/challenges-advances-adaptive-risk-management/docview/3052215861/se-2>
- Gemünden, H. G., Lehner, P., & Kock, A. (2018). The project-oriented organization and its contribution to innovation. *International Journal of Project Management*, 36(1), 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.08.004>

Goswami, A. (2024). Nuanced approaches to managing organizational risks in digital ecosystems. *Journal of Risk Analysis*, *44*(1), 89–105.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13982>

Grandage, A. J. (2021). Advancing capital project management. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, *33*(5), 618–634.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBAFM-01-2021-0003>

Gupta, R., Tat, Q., O'Brien, J., Shaw, M., Cumbler, E., McPherson, R., de la Cruz, D., Dua, A., & Yi, J. A. (2022). Utilization of lean project management principles and health informatics to reduce operating room delays in a vascular surgery practice.

The American Journal of Surgery, *223*(1), 176–181.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2021.07.040>

HashiCorp. (2023). 10 strategies to mitigate hybrid cloud risk.

<https://www.hashicorp.com/en/blog/10-strategies-to-mitigate-hybrid-cloud-risk>

Helder Jose Celani, d. S., Pamplona Salomon, V. A., & Carlos Eduardo Sanches, d. S. (2023). Statistical predictors of project management maturity. *Stats*, *6*(3), 868.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/stats6030054>

Herrera, J., Smith, L., & Gupta, A. (2021). Digital transformation and risk management: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Risk Analysis*, *41*(2), 123–140.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13567>

Hillson, D., & Murray-Webster, R. (2017). *Understanding and managing risk attitude* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Huaman-Orosco, C., Erazo-Rondinel, A., & Herrera, R. F. (2022). Barriers to adopting

lean construction in small and medium-sized enterprises The case of Peru.

Buildings, 12(10), 1637. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12101637>

Huang, G., Lee, S.-M., & Clinciu, D. L. (2023). Competitive advantages of organizational project management maturity: A quantitative descriptive study in Australia. *PLoS ONE*, 17(6), e0287225.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287225>

Ibeanu, C., Mazyar, G. N., & Ghasemi, M. (2023). Developing effective project management strategy for urban flood disaster prevention project in EDO State Capital, Nigeria. *Urban Science*, 7(2), 37.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci7020037>

Javed, S., Bamford, J., & Abualqumboz, M. (2021). Helping Deluxe Beds to sleep easy: A case study of agile project management. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 22(2), 132–139.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750320974942>

Kadhim, A. H., & Shiker, F. A. (2024). The impact of organizational project management maturity on project success: A case study in the Middle East. *International Journal of Project Management*, 42(1), 45–59.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.11.001>

Kenny, J. (2003). Effective project management for strategic innovation and change in an organizational context. *Project Management Journal*, 34(1), 43–53.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/875697280303400106>

Khan, S., Ahmad, M., & Khan, R. (2024). Managing risk: Mitigation and resilience

- strategies. *ProQuest*. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/managing-risk-mitigation-resilience-strategies/docview/2378804859/se-2>
- Klymenko, O., Meisenbacher, S., & Matthes, F. (2023). Identifying practical challenges in the implementation of technical measures for data privacy compliance. *arXiv Preprint*, arXiv:2306.15497. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.15497>
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Lee, C., & Kim, H. (2023). Organizational project management maturity and competitive advantage: Evidence from Korean firms. *International Journal of Project Management*, 41(4), 230–243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.12.010>
- Lutwama, P., Dlulane, M., Pillay, T., Hassan, F. S., & Grobbelaar, S. (2024). AGILE: Advantages, disadvantages, enablers, and barriers. *South African Journal of Industrial Engineering*, 35(4), 66–76. <https://doi.org/10.7166/35-4-3058>
- Mamman, H., Abdullateef, O. B., Basri, S., Capretz, L. F., Adeyemo, V. E., Abdullahi, A. I., & Kumar, G. (2023). Software requirement risk prediction using enhanced fuzzy induction models. *Electronics*, 12(18), 3805. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12183805>
- Martínez, J., & Pérez, L. (2024). The role of organizational culture in project management maturity: A systematic review. *International Journal of Project Management*, 42(3), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.10.005>
- Mendy, J. (2025). *How project management offices in financial organizations determine governance in hybrid projects for successful outcomes* (Order No. 32115389)

[Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest One Academic].

<https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/how-project-management-offices-financial/docview/3218324159/se-2>

Mhatre, P., & Mehta, V. (2023). Phenomenological approaches in organizational research: Deepening understanding of project manager decision-making.

International Journal of Management Research, 15(2), 98–113.

Moradi, S., & Sormunen, P. (2023). Implementing lean construction: A literature study of barriers, enablers, and implications. *Buildings*, 13(2), 556.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13020556>

Morris, B. D. (2021). *Application of project management strategies and tools for an efficient and successful competition-based engineering senior capstone design project* (Order No. 29058048) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest].

<https://doi.org/10.33915/etd.10210>

Nguyen, T., Brown, K., & Wilson, J. (2023). Contextual variability in project management: Implications for research design. *Project Management Journal*, 54(2), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728231101234>

Nguyen, H., Torres, P., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Barriers to effective risk management in construction projects. *Construction Management Journal*, 41(3), 201-219.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349562353_The_Correlation_between_Emotional_Intelligence_and_Project_Management_Success

Nikolaenko, V., & Sidorov, A. (2023). Assessment of project management maturity models strengths and weaknesses. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*,

16(2), 121. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm16020121>

Norman, A. A., Marzuki, A. H., Faith, F., & Hamid, S. (2023). Technology dependency and impact during COVID-19: A systematic literature review and open challenges. *IEEE Access*, *11*, 22976–22997.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3242228>

Nhambure, E. S. (2021). *Project risk management strategies for increased information technology project performance: A Delphi study* (Order No. 28769397) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest One Academic]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/project-risk-management-strategies-increased/docview/2584358458/se-2>

Obaid, W., & Sidique, S. F. (2024). Task interdependence mediates the relationships among emotional intelligence, cultural intelligence, and project performance. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *10*(1), 2408874.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2408874>

Otto, C., & Syal, M. G. M. (2023). Lean construction and design-build projects. *The Professional Constructor*, 43–59. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/lean-construction-design-build-projects/docview/2873565071/se-2>

Osei-Kyei, R., Chan, A. P. C., & Chen, Z. (2023). Best practices and implementation challenges in effective project management. *ResearchGate*.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379302917_Best_Practices_and_Implementation_Challenges_in_Effective_Project_Management

Orieno, R., Mensah, S., & Adjei, D. (2024). Navigating information uncertainty in project risk management: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Project*

- Management*, 42(2), 156–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.11.002>
- Ottaviani, F. M., De Marco, A., Rafele, C., & Castelblanco, G. (2024). Risk perception-based project contingency management framework. *Systems*, 12(3), 93. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12030093>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Papp-Horváth, V., Tóth, J., & Tóth, N. (2024). The evolution of the project management competence concept – A systematic literature review. *Vezetéstudomány / Budapest Management Review*, 55(7/8), 4–17. <https://doi.org/10.14267/VEZTUD.2024.07-08.02>
- Patel, R., & Singh, A. (2022). Integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches in project risk assessment. *Journal of Risk Research*, 25(6), 789–805. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2021.1934567>
- Pett, P. (2023). Hybrid risk management methodology adapted to project life cycle and project management strategy. *ProjectManagement.com*. <https://www.projectmanagement.com/blog-post/73047/hybrid-risk-management-methodology-adapted-to-project-life-cycle-and-project-management-strategy->
- Pérez Castillo, Y. J., Orantes Jiménez, S. D., & Orlando, P. L. T. (2024). Sprint management in agile approach: Progress and velocity evaluation applying

- machine learning. *Information*, 15(11), 726. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info15110726>
- Project Management Institute. (2021). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) (7th ed.)*. Project Management Institute.
- Qazi, A., Emre, M. C., & Kassem, M. (2021). Risk assessment of construction projects using Monte Carlo simulation. *ProQuest*. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/risk-assessment-construction-projects-using-monte/docview/2548967768/se-2>
- Qian, Y., Fang, Y., & Gonzalez, J. J. (2012). Managing information security risks during new technology adoption. *Computers & Security*, 31(8), 859–864. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2012.07.001>
- Riskconnect. (2023). Hybrid working risks: Cybersecurity, staff retention, and employee well-being. <https://riskconnect.com/integrated-risk-management/hybrid-working-risks/>
- Robles, J. (2023). Fast-track projects with cost and schedule overruns: A supply chain management perspective [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing].
- Rostami, M., & Ahangari, M. A. (2022). The effect of PMBOK knowledge areas on critical success factors in oil and gas projects in Iran: A SEM modelling. *Iranian Journal of Oil & Gas Science & Technology*, 11(4), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.22050/ijogst.2023.381640.1665>
- Saghafian, M., Laumann, K., & Skogstad, M. R. (2021). Stagewise overview of issues influencing organizational technology adoption and use. *Frontiers in Psychology*,

12, Article 630145. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.630145>

Sara, G. B., & Debs, L. (2024). Principles for adopting offsite construction in design and construction companies focused on multifamily projects in the USA. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, *31*(11), 4308–4329.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-03-2022-0262>

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Serfilippi, E., Giovannucci, D., Ameyaw, D., Bansal, A., Thomas Asafua, N. W., Blankson, R., & Mishra, R. (2022). Benefits and challenges of making data more agile: A review of recent key approaches in agriculture. *Sustainability*, *14*(24), 16480. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142416480>

Silva, M., Torres, L., & Vergara, R. (2023). Dynamic risk capabilities in complex project environments. *International Journal of Project Management*, *41*(6), 320–335.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.01.008>

Spokas, K. A., Bogner, J., & Corcoran, M. (2021). Modeling landfill CH₄ emissions: CALMIM international field validation, using CALMIM to simulate management strategies, current and future climate scenarios. *Elementa*, *9*(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2020.00050>

Stone, C. L. (2022). Exploring the procedures project managers need to improve for successful projects using EVM (Order No. 29326096) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest One Academic]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/exploring-procedures-project-managers-need/docview/2718154844/se-2>

- Tanaka, H., & Fujimoto, S. (2021). Resilience in project management: Adaptive strategies under uncertainty. *Project Management Journal*, 52(4), 309–325.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728211012345>
- Tjahjono, B., Alfian, G., & Purnomo, H. (2023). A three-stage value-creation model for life cycle management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 421, Article 137810.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137810>
- Tian, X., Yang, J., & Jian, Z. (2022). The effect of project management maturity on project success: Evidence from China. *International Journal of Project Management*, 40(7), 529–540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.05.006>
- Uddin, S., Ong, S., & Matous, P. (2023). Stakeholder engagement variability across public, private and public-private partnership projects: A data-driven network-based analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 18(1), e0279916.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0279916>
- Varajão, J., Marques, R. P., & Trigo, A. (2022). Project management processes – Impact on the success of information systems projects. *Informatica*, 33(2), 421–436.
<https://doi.org/10.15388/22-INFOR488>
- Vergara, R., Silva, M., & Torres, L. (2025). Decision making and organizational complexity in project management research: A methodological review. *Project Management Review*, 11(1), 23–42.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.
- Wahjusaputra, W. (2023). Managing upstream oil & gas projects to achieve 1 million

BOPD & 12 billion SCFD in 2030 using world-class project management (WCPM). *International Petroleum Technology Conference*.

<https://doi.org/10.2523/IPTC-23890-MS>

Wang, J., & Chen, L. (2022). Adaptive risk management in digital project ecosystems. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 69(4), 1100–1112.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2022.3156789>

Whitely, O. (2025). Strategies for reducing cost overruns on government-funded infrastructure projects in Jamaica (Order No. 32114786) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/strategies-reducing-cost-overruns-on-government/docview/3217290341/se-2>

Williams, T. (2003). Assessing extension of time delays on major projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(1), 19–26. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863\(02\)00013-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-7863(02)00013-9)

Woolcott, J. (2024). Advancing PMO maturity: A framework to integrate data governance and data ethics measures in project management maturity assessments (Order No. 31332595) [Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest One Academic]. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/advancing-pmo-maturity-framework-integrate-data/docview/3069499388/se-2>

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Zhang, Y., & Wang, X. (2023). Technological disruption and project risk: A systematic review. *Technology in Society*, 75, 102987.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102987>

Zhang, Z., Liu, H., & Xu, Q. (2024). Multi-layered risk governance in agile project management. *International Journal of Project Management*, 43(1), 55–68.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.12.006>.

Zwikael, O., & Svensson, L. (2023). Value creation through project risk management: Literature review and empirical study. *Sustainability*, 16(2), 753.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020753>

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

1. Contact potential participants to obtain their consent to participate in the interview.
2. Confirm each participant's availability and schedule the interview time and date.
3. Create and send a Zoom meeting link to each participant after scheduling confirmation.
4. Inform participants that the interview will last approximately 15 to 30 minutes.
5. At the start of the interview, I verbally request permission to record the session for transcription.
6. Upon receiving consent to record, thank the participant and begin the interview.
7. Conduct the interview using a consistent set of 10 questions asked in the same order to facilitate analysis.
8. At the conclusion, thank the participant and inform them that the transcript will be sent for their review and approval.
9. Send the transcribed interviews to participants for member checking.
10. Conduct follow-up as needed to confirm transcript accuracy and acceptance.

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. What risk management tools have you used to increase project management efficiencies?
2. How do you assess the effectiveness of the risk management strategies applied?
3. How often do you assess the effectiveness of risk management strategies applied?
4. How do project management efficiency strategies affect overall project costs?
5. How do project management efficiency strategies affect the overall performance of the organization?
6. How do project management efficiency strategies affect the overall profitability of the organization?
7. How might you change or adapt project management efficiency strategies to further improve costs, performance challenges, or profitability needs?
8. What results would you expect to see from any changes or adjustments made to your strategies?
9. What additional information can you provide to help me understand project management efficiency strategies?
10. Is there any additional information you would like to share?