

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY FUTURISTIC DEVELOPMENT

Agile Deployment Model for Technology Solutions in Resource-Constrained Environments

Oladipupo Fasawe ^{1*}, Akindamola Samuel Akinola ², Christiana Onyinyechi Okpokwu ³

¹ The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, USA

² Nigerian Breweries PLC, Lagos, Nigeria (Heineken company)

³ Zenith Bank PLC, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

* Corresponding Author: **Oladipupo Fasawe**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3618

E-ISSN: 3051-3626

Volume: 01

Issue: 02

July – December 2020

Received: 23-05-2020

Accepted: 22-06-2020

Published: 16-07-2020

Page No: 86-96

Abstract

The deployment of technology solutions in resource-constrained environments presents unique challenges that traditional project management approaches often fail to address. Limited infrastructure, financial constraints, and skill shortages necessitate innovative and adaptive methodologies that ensure efficiency, scalability, and sustainability. Agile deployment models, with their iterative cycles, stakeholder engagement, and flexibility, offer a promising framework for overcoming these barriers. This review synthesizes existing literature on agile principles, adaptation strategies, and implementation practices tailored to environments characterized by scarcity of resources. It examines how agile methods can optimize technology deployment by reducing overhead, fostering collaboration, and improving responsiveness to contextual challenges. Furthermore, the study highlights case applications across sectors such as healthcare, education, and public administration, demonstrating the potential of agile models in bridging digital divides and enhancing long-term impact. The review concludes by proposing a conceptual framework that integrates agile practices with context-sensitive adaptations, ensuring that technology solutions are not only effectively deployed but also sustainable in resource-constrained settings.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMFD.2020.1.2.86-96>

Keywords: Agile Deployment, Resource-Constrained Environments, Technology Solutions, Adaptive Frameworks, Iterative Development, Sustainable Implementation.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of technology deployment in resource-constrained environments

Technology deployment in resource-constrained environments is shaped by a convergence of infrastructural limitations, financial restrictions, and organizational challenges. These environments often encompass low-income communities, emerging economies, or institutions facing structural deficiencies that hinder the efficient rollout of technological solutions. The lack of stable connectivity, high operational costs, and underdeveloped digital infrastructures impede the scalability of projects, demanding innovative models that reduce barriers to adoption (Adeyelu, Ugochukwu, & Shonibare, 2020). Moreover, the scarcity of skilled personnel compounds these difficulties, as organizations must adapt to constrained human capacity while still ensuring that deployed solutions meet operational standards and user expectations (Mgbame, Akpe, Abayomi, Ogbuefi, & Adeyelu, 2020).

In addition to infrastructural and human capital gaps, the economic fragility of such contexts creates unique pressures on project sustainability. Many initiatives are prematurely discontinued due to the inability to secure recurrent funding or to align with evolving market conditions (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2019). As a result, organizations are compelled to deploy lightweight frameworks capable of maximizing impact within limited budgets, while simultaneously building resilience against volatility in external environments (Atobatele, Ajayi, Hungbo, & Adeyemi, 2019).

These realities illustrate that traditional, resource-intensive deployment methodologies are ill-suited for such settings, hence underscoring the need for adaptive strategies that are efficient, scalable, and context-sensitive.

1.2. Rationale for adopting agile models

Agile models provide a compelling alternative for technology deployment in environments marked by resource scarcity, as they emphasize iterative progress, rapid adaptation, and stakeholder involvement. Unlike traditional project management approaches that often demand significant upfront investment and rigid structures, agile frameworks permit incremental development cycles that align with evolving priorities and available resources (Adelusi, Uzoka, Hassan, & Ojika, 2020). This adaptability is particularly crucial where infrastructural deficiencies or financial constraints make long-term planning precarious. Agile methods allow teams to pivot quickly, mitigating risks by embedding responsiveness into the deployment process (Akpe, Mgbame, Ogbuefi, Abayomi, & Adeyelu, 2020). Furthermore, agile models encourage co-creation and inclusive participation, principles that are essential in resource-constrained contexts where projects must accommodate diverse user needs and socio-cultural realities. By integrating iterative feedback loops, organizations can ensure that solutions are not only technically viable but also socially relevant and sustainable (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2020). The incremental delivery of value also minimizes sunk costs, thereby improving the feasibility of initiatives that operate under uncertain funding streams (Nwani, Abiola-Adams, Otokiti, & Ogeawuchi, 2020). These characteristics position agile models as not merely a methodological preference but as a strategic imperative for advancing technology solutions that thrive under constraints, while simultaneously enhancing resilience and sustainability.

1.3. Objectives of the review

The primary objective of this review is to critically examine the applicability and effectiveness of agile deployment models for technology solutions in resource-constrained environments. It seeks to identify how agile principles can be tailored to address infrastructural limitations, financial restrictions, and human capacity deficits that typify these settings. The review also aims to synthesize existing evidence from diverse sectors, highlighting practical insights into the ways agile methodologies enhance adaptability, foster stakeholder participation, and ensure sustainable implementation. Additionally, the study aspires to propose a context-sensitive framework that can guide practitioners, policymakers, and researchers in deploying agile-driven technological innovations in resource-limited contexts.

1.4. Structure of the paper

The paper is organized into six interrelated sections. Following the introduction, the second section provides a detailed exploration of the conceptual foundations of agile deployment, comparing its principles with traditional deployment approaches. The third section examines the unique challenges of resource-constrained environments, situating them within the broader context of infrastructural, financial, and organizational realities. The fourth section evaluates agile adaptations that have been specifically designed for these contexts, supported by illustrative examples. The fifth section highlights sectoral applications of

agile deployment, focusing on healthcare, education, and public administration. Finally, the sixth section synthesizes the findings, proposes a conceptual framework, and outlines recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.

2. Conceptual Foundations of Agile Deployment

2.1. Overview of agile principles and methodologies

Agile principles and methodologies emerged as a response to the rigidity and inefficiencies of traditional project management, emphasizing adaptability, iterative delivery, and stakeholder collaboration. At its core, agile promotes continuous improvement, customer-centric design, and flexibility in responding to evolving requirements. Methodologies such as Scrum, Kanban, and Lean enable small cross-functional teams to deliver incremental value while adjusting goals based on feedback loops and changing contexts. This approach resonates with environments where uncertainty and volatility dominate, allowing projects to evolve dynamically rather than being constrained by static upfront planning (Adelusi, Uzoka, Hassan, & Ojika, 2020). Agile principles align well with the needs of digital innovation, where rapid prototyping and minimum viable products can test ideas cost-effectively before scaling to full implementation (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2020).

The agile philosophy is rooted in the *Agile Manifesto*, which emphasizes individuals and interactions over processes, working software over documentation, and customer collaboration over contract negotiation (Beck *et al.*, 2001). In practice, agile methodologies embody lightweight frameworks designed to optimize responsiveness. Daily stand-ups, sprint reviews, and retrospective sessions enhance team communication and ensure that value delivery remains aligned with stakeholder needs (Akpe, Mgbame, Ogbuefi, Abayomi, & Adeyelu, 2020). Agile emphasizes not only technical excellence but also the empowerment of individuals and teams, thereby fostering ownership and accountability within constrained operational contexts (Adewusi, Adekunle, Mustapha, & Uzoka, 2020). Furthermore, agile encourages modular development, which reduces the risks of systemic failures common in monolithic deployments. Over the past two decades, scholarly work has underscored how agile has matured from software-specific practices into a global project management paradigm (Dingsøyr, Nerur, Baliyepally, & Moe, 2012). These characteristics collectively position agile as more than a set of practices; it functions as a philosophy that empowers teams to adapt and thrive even when faced with uncertainty, limited resources, or infrastructural barriers (Essien, Cadet, Ajayi, Erigha, & Obuse, 2019).

2.2. Agile vs. traditional deployment approaches

Traditional deployment methodologies, such as the Waterfall model, are characterized by sequential stages where requirements, design, implementation, and testing are rigidly defined. While effective in stable environments, these approaches struggle when requirements shift or when resource limitations impose constraints on delivery timelines. Agile, by contrast, thrives in dynamic contexts by prioritizing adaptability, incremental delivery, and stakeholder engagement (Abass, Balogun, & Didi, 2020). This contrast underscores why agile models are increasingly adopted in technology deployments where conditions are fluid, and outcomes are difficult to predict (Nwani, Abiola-Adams, Otokiti, & Ogeawuchi, 2020). Agile emphasizes shorter development cycles that facilitate continuous feedback,

thereby minimizing the risk of delivering outdated or irrelevant solutions. This adaptive orientation is particularly important in industries beyond software, where agile has demonstrated its value in manufacturing, energy, and education sectors (Conforto, Salum, Amaral, da Silva, & de Almeida, 2016). The trade-offs between the two models also highlight the superiority of agile in resource-constrained environments. Traditional models often demand high upfront capital, extensive documentation, and fixed infrastructures that may not exist in low-resource settings (Atobatele, Hungbo, & Adeyemi, 2019). Agile counters this with low-cost iterations, minimal documentation requirements, and flexibility in resource allocation, making it feasible for small organizations to implement complex technology solutions (Okenwa, Uzozie, & Onaghinor, 2019). Moreover, agile ensures a stronger connection between developers and end-users, reducing mismatches between technological outputs and contextual realities (Akinrinoye, Kufile, Otokiti, Ejike, Umezurike, & Onifade, 2020). As industry surveys such as the *State of Agile* report demonstrate, agile adoption continues to accelerate globally due to its perceived ability to improve productivity, quality, and adaptability compared to traditional methods (VersionOne, 2017). These differences illustrate that while traditional models emphasize control and predictability, agile methodologies prioritize resilience, contextual alignment, and user relevance.

2.3. Relevance of agile in addressing resource constraints
Agile methodologies are uniquely suited to environments where financial, infrastructural, and human resources are limited. Iterative development cycles allow organizations to deploy small, functional components of technology solutions,

testing their utility before scaling up. This incremental deployment reduces the risk of resource wastage, a crucial advantage where budgets and infrastructure are constrained (Mgbame, Akpe, Abayomi, Ogbuefi, & Adeyelu, 2020). Agile’s emphasis on collaboration and feedback loops ensures that stakeholder insights are continuously integrated, enhancing alignment with contextual realities and reducing resistance to adoption (Asata, Nyangoma, & Okolo, 2020). These features make agile particularly effective in emerging markets where projects often fail due to the mismatch between imported methodologies and local conditions (Evans-Uzosike & Okatta, 2019). Additionally, agile fosters resource efficiency by embedding adaptability into project structures. Practices such as backlog refinement and iterative sprint planning enable organizations to prioritize high-value features while deferring less critical tasks, thereby ensuring optimal use of scarce resources (Abass, Balogun, & Didi, 2019). The modularity of agile also allows teams to leverage open-source tools and cost-effective platforms, addressing infrastructure gaps without overreliance on expensive proprietary systems (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2019). This adaptability extends to human resources, as agile frameworks promote capacity-building through cross-functional teams, enabling organizations to maximize the utility of available talent (Odinaka, Okolo, Chima, & Adeyelu, 2020). Scholars have further argued that agile is not just a methodology but a transformative business philosophy capable of redefining how organizations survive in turbulent and resource-limited contexts (Denning, 2018). Collectively, these attributes underscore agile’s strategic relevance as a model for ensuring sustainable, impactful deployment of technology in resource-constrained environments as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Relevance of Agile in Addressing Resource Constraints

Key Dimension	Agile Practice	Benefit in Resource-Constrained Environments	Outcome
Financial Constraints	Incremental deployment, backlog refinement, sprint planning	Optimizes use of scarce budgets by focusing on high-value features	Reduced risk of wastage and improved financial efficiency
Infrastructural Limitations	Modular design, use of open-source and low-cost platforms	Reduces reliance on costly proprietary systems	Feasible technology deployment despite infrastructure gaps
Human Resource Shortages	Cross-functional teams, capacity-building, adaptability	Maximizes utility of available talent and enhances skill diversity	Strengthened workforce resilience and improved project delivery
Contextual Realities	Iterative feedback loops, stakeholder collaboration	Ensures alignment with local needs and conditions	Higher adoption rates and long-term sustainability of deployed solutions

3. Challenges in Resource-Constrained Environments

3.1. Infrastructure and connectivity limitations

Infrastructure and connectivity constraints remain one of the most significant barriers to agile deployment of technology solutions in resource-constrained environments. Many of these contexts are characterized by unreliable power supply, weak broadband penetration, and limited digital infrastructure, which directly hinder the scalability and efficiency of technological systems (Adeyelu, Ugochukwu, & Shonibare, 2020). Inadequate infrastructure not only disrupts implementation timelines but also forces organizations to design highly adaptive, low-bandwidth solutions that can operate under unpredictable conditions. Moreover, the uneven distribution of digital connectivity deepens inequality, leaving rural and marginalized populations with fewer opportunities to benefit from technological interventions (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2019). Emerging evidence suggests that infrastructure gaps also

exacerbate operational costs, as organizations are compelled to invest in redundant systems or alternative energy sources to sustain technology deployment (Etim, Essien, Ajayi, Erigha, & Obuse, 2019). These costs restrict scalability, especially for small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that already operate under constrained budgets. In response, strategies such as mobile-first approaches and modular architectures have been explored, though their effectiveness remains uneven (Foster & Azmeh, 2020). Infrastructure limitations thus highlight the critical need for agile frameworks that are lightweight, resilient, and capable of functioning in fragmented ecosystems (James, Hinson, & Agyei, 2019).

3.2. Financial and budgetary constraints

Financial and budgetary obstacles present significant challenges, particularly for organizations operating with limited resources, as these organizations frequently struggle

to secure the necessary capital to maintain technological advancements over extended periods. A significant number of projects are unable to advance beyond initial pilot programs due to the uncertainties of funding availability and the lack of established methods for financial support (Nwani, Abiola-Adams, Otokiti, & Ogeawuchi, 2020). These inconsistent funding patterns can severely hamper the ability of organizations to implement and sustain technological initiatives. Furthermore, the absence of well-defined financial structures makes it difficult to plan and execute long-term technology strategies. Even in situations where external funding sources are accessible, the actual distribution of funds is often subject to considerable delays or accompanied by strict requirements imposed by donors, which can restrict the ability of organizations to adjust their strategies and adapt to changing circumstances (Fiemotongha, Olajide, Otokiti, Nwani, Ogunmokin, & Adekunle, 2020). These inflexible conditions associated with external funding can impede the effective utilization of resources and limit the overall impact of technology projects. The combination of funding delays and rigid donor conditions can create substantial barriers to successful technology adoption and implementation in resource-constrained environments.

Additionally, many organizations lack internal budgetary frameworks to align agile practices with long-term cost efficiency (EYINADE, Ezeilo, & Ogundeji, 2020). This challenge is compounded by inflationary pressures and volatile markets that force frequent reprioritization of limited financial resources (Oladuji, Nwangele, Onifade, & Akintobi, 2020). Agile models can mitigate these issues by breaking down financial commitments into smaller, iterative investments, allowing organizations to adjust to fluctuating budgets while still delivering incremental value (Hobbs & Petit, 2017). However, financial constraints remain a fundamental obstacle, especially in contexts where financial governance is underdeveloped and access to credit is limited (Mwaura, 2021).

3.3. Skills and capacity deficits

A significant obstacle to the successful adoption of agile methodologies lies in the limitations of human resources. Institutions operating within resource-constrained settings frequently encounter ongoing shortages of crucial technical skills. These deficits span a wide spectrum of competencies, encompassing areas such as fundamental project management capabilities and extending to more sophisticated levels of digital literacy, as highlighted by Akinrinoye, Kufile, Otokiti, Ejike, Umezurike, & Onifade (2020). The absence of a sufficiently skilled workforce to effectively promote and guide the implementation of agile approaches often leads to challenges in ensuring that technology solutions can readily adapt to evolving requirements and shifting priorities. In situations where organizations lack personnel with the necessary expertise in agile methodologies, the intended benefits of these solutions may not be fully realized, and their ability to respond to changing needs can be severely hampered. Moreover, the common practice of relying heavily on expatriate staff or external consulting firms introduces additional financial burdens, significantly escalating the overall costs associated with implementation. This dependence on external expertise can also have a detrimental effect on fostering a sense of local ownership and responsibility for the technological systems

being deployed, as noted by Evans-Uzosike & Okatta (2019). When local personnel are not actively involved in the design, development, and maintenance of these systems, their commitment to the long-term success and sustainability of the technology may be diminished.

Capacity deficits are not limited to technical skills but extend to managerial and organizational competencies needed to sustain iterative, stakeholder-driven projects (Ikponmwoba, Chima, Ezeilo, Ojonugwa, Ochefu, & Adesuyi, 2020). Agile frameworks emphasize collaboration and cross-functional teams, yet in many cases, hierarchical structures limit the ability of staff to contribute meaningfully. Training and capacity-building initiatives have attempted to address these challenges, but their coverage is often fragmented and inconsistent (Fiore, 2019). Bridging these gaps requires not only investment in skills development but also institutional reforms that empower staff to actively engage in agile processes (Ndayizigamiye & Shambare, 2020).

3.4. Cultural and organizational barriers

Cultural and organizational environments exert a significant influence on how readily agile deployment models are embraced and implemented. Specifically, in environments where resources are scarce, organizational cultures often exhibit several characteristics that can impede the adoption of agile methodologies. These characteristics commonly include firmly established hierarchies, a tendency to avoid risk-taking, and a general sluggishness due to bureaucratic processes. All of these traits stand in contrast to the fundamental principles of agile, which emphasize iterative development, flexibility, and adaptability (Gbenle, Akpe, Owoade, Ubanadu, & Daraojimba, 2020). The presence of such rigid hierarchies means that decision-making is often centralized and slow, hindering the rapid adjustments that agile requires. Aversion to risk discourages teams from trying new approaches or challenging existing norms, which is essential for agile's iterative nature. Bureaucratic inertia, with its complex procedures and approvals, further slows down the agile process, which depends on quick responses and changes. These cultural dynamics collectively diminish the enthusiasm of teams to engage in experimentation, to readily adapt to changing circumstances, or to fully embrace practices that are driven by stakeholder input, and the ultimate outcome is a deceleration of deployment processes (Nwaimo, Oluoha, & Oyedokun, 2019). The reluctance to experiment means that teams are less likely to discover innovative solutions or to optimize their processes. A lack of adaptability prevents teams from responding effectively to evolving requirements or unexpected challenges. And a resistance to stakeholder-driven practices isolates teams from valuable feedback and insights.

Resistance to change is further amplified by organizational silos and misaligned incentive structures, which discourage cross-functional collaboration (Ilufeye, Akinrinoye, & Okolo, 2020). The lack of institutional frameworks to support agile practices results in fragmented adoption, where some departments embrace innovation while others cling to traditional methods. These inconsistencies undermine the holistic transformation required for agile to succeed. Addressing cultural and organizational barriers requires fostering adaptive leadership, realigning incentives, and promoting values of transparency and collaboration (Dennehy & Conboy, 2018). Without such shifts, the promise of agile deployment in resource-constrained contexts risks

being undermined by entrenched institutional behaviors.

4. Agile Adaptations for Resource-Constrained Contexts

4.1. Lightweight and modular agile practices

Lightweight and modular agile practices represent an essential adaptation for technology deployment in resource-constrained environments, where efficiency and cost-effectiveness are paramount. Unlike resource-intensive frameworks, lightweight agile practices emphasize simplicity, reduced documentation, and modular design principles that can be incrementally implemented without overwhelming existing infrastructure. Modular approaches enable solutions to be developed in smaller, manageable components, which reduces initial capital requirements and allows progressive scaling as resources become available. In such settings, practices like Scrum with shortened sprint cycles and Kanban boards adapted to low-technology contexts provide visibility and flexibility while minimizing overhead. These methods enhance the capacity of organizations to implement agile processes even when digital tools or advanced project management systems are inaccessible (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2020). The modularity also supports resilience, enabling the rapid substitution or reconfiguration of system components to respond to emerging needs, thus avoiding costly project overhauls (Adeyelu, Ugochukwu, & Shonibare, 2020).

Scholarly evidence affirms that lightweight agile practices are particularly effective in contexts where resources and capabilities are fragmented. For instance, by adopting modular agile frameworks, organizations can avoid the rigidity of traditional deployment models that often fail in uncertain financial and infrastructural landscapes (Sobowale *et al.*, 2020). The iterative and flexible character of these practices supports faster experimentation and learning, essential for environments where trial-and-error can illuminate context-specific constraints. This modular orientation is also consistent with the notion of frugal innovation, which underscores doing more with less by prioritizing essential functionalities over complex, resource-heavy designs (Bhatti *et al.*, 2018). Ultimately, lightweight and modular agile practices provide organizations with the tools to balance ambition and constraint, creating space for innovation while mitigating risks inherent in fragile deployment environments (Conboy & Carroll, 2019).

4.2. Stakeholder-driven iterative cycles

Stakeholder-driven iterative cycles form the backbone of agile adaptation in resource-constrained environments, as they emphasize collaboration, feedback, and co-creation. This participatory orientation ensures that technology solutions are continuously refined in alignment with the evolving needs of stakeholders, including users, implementers, and funders. In settings where cultural and contextual factors strongly influence adoption, stakeholder engagement becomes a strategic imperative. Iterative cycles promote inclusivity by allowing feedback to be integrated at every stage, thereby increasing the relevance and acceptance of deployed technologies (Atobatele, Hungbo, & Adeyemi, 2019). Such engagement also compensates for the knowledge asymmetries that typically characterize resource-constrained environments, as the lived experiences of end-users provide critical insights for adaptive redesigns (Essien *et al.*, 2019). Empirical studies show that embedding stakeholders in iterative cycles strengthens accountability and fosters trust in

deployment processes. For example, iterative engagement minimizes misalignment between project deliverables and user expectations, thus reducing risks of project abandonment (Nwaimo, Oluoha, & Oyedokun, 2019). In healthcare and education projects, participatory feedback loops have been linked with enhanced sustainability of interventions, as communities become co-owners rather than passive beneficiaries of the solutions (Evans-Uzosike & Okatta, 2019). Furthermore, the inclusion of diverse stakeholders across cycles enhances learning agility, enabling projects to pivot effectively in response to contextual shocks such as funding shortages or infrastructural disruptions (Alahyari, Berntsson Svensson, & Gorschek, 2017). In sum, stakeholder-driven iterative cycles are not only a methodological advantage but also a structural necessity for ensuring that agile deployments in resource-limited contexts are culturally grounded, socially accepted, and operationally resilient (Dennehy & Conboy, 2019).

4.3. Integration of open-source and low-cost tools

The integration of open-source and low-cost tools represents a pragmatic strategy for overcoming budgetary and infrastructural constraints in resource-limited environments. Open-source tools offer the dual benefits of affordability and customizability, allowing organizations to avoid prohibitive licensing fees while adapting systems to local needs. Low-cost tools, often characterized by reduced functionality but increased accessibility, ensure that even small-scale organizations can implement agile deployment frameworks without financial overreach. For instance, digital collaboration platforms adapted for low bandwidth environments have proven vital for sustaining agile processes in underserved regions (Ikponmwoba *et al.*, 2020). These tools provide transparency and accountability, ensuring that iterative development cycles remain visible to all stakeholders despite infrastructural barriers (Olajide *et al.*, 2020).

Academic literature corroborates the transformative role of open-source adoption in amplifying the effectiveness of agile practices. In education and healthcare, for example, low-cost platforms have been leveraged to support rapid solution scaling while maintaining financial sustainability (Akinrinoye *et al.*, 2020). Open-source systems also promote capacity building, as local developers can modify and enhance systems, fostering long-term independence from external vendors (Bukhari, Oladimeji, Etim, & Ajayi, 2020). From a strategic standpoint, integrating these tools aligns with the principles of technological democratization, extending access to agile frameworks beyond well-resourced enterprises (Uzozie, Onaghinor, & Okenwa, 2019). Furthermore, leveraging open-source ecosystems encourages collaboration across institutions, enabling shared learning and the pooling of scarce resources (Morgan, 2016). The result is a more resilient and equitable deployment model, well-suited to the realities of constrained environments (Stol & Fitzgerald, 2018).

4.4. Case examples of adapted agile deployment

Several case examples illustrate how agile deployment has been successfully adapted to resource-constrained environments through context-sensitive innovation. In healthcare, agile methodologies have been employed to deploy mobile health solutions for tuberculosis diagnosis in Nigeria, with iterative cycles improving efficiency despite

infrastructural challenges (Eneogu *et al.*, 2020). Similarly, in education, e-learning initiatives built on modular and open-source platforms have enabled incremental scaling in communities with limited connectivity (Olasoji, Iziduh, & Adeyelu, 2020). These examples highlight the flexibility of agile models to adapt across sectors, ensuring that interventions remain feasible despite resource scarcities. Notably, the strategic use of lightweight practices and open-source technologies amplified sustainability while reducing dependency on external funding sources (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2020).

Beyond sector-specific examples, agile deployment in public administration demonstrates how iterative and inclusive approaches can improve governance outcomes in constrained environments. For instance, the use of agile practices in local government accounting systems has been linked with greater transparency and efficiency, even in the face of financial and infrastructural limitations (Ikponmwoba *et al.*, 2020). Case studies also show that leveraging low-cost platforms facilitated stakeholder-driven collaboration across fragmented administrative structures, producing measurable improvements in service delivery (Gbenle *et al.*, 2020). These applications affirm the universality of agile’s adaptability and underscore the model’s relevance in fostering innovation within fragile systems (Dybå & Dingsøyr, 2015). Collectively, such cases demonstrate the versatility and resilience of agile deployment models, affirming their capacity to bridge systemic gaps and generate sustainable impact in resource-constrained contexts (Hoda, Noble, & Marshall, 2017).

5. Sectoral Applications of Agile Deployment

5.1. Healthcare technologies (telemedicine, digital health platforms)

The integration of agile deployment in healthcare technologies has been particularly transformative in resource-constrained environments, where infrastructural deficiencies and financial limitations undermine traditional healthcare delivery. Agile methodologies enable the incremental rollout of telemedicine platforms, allowing developers and healthcare providers to test, adapt, and refine services in response to real-time challenges (Atobatele, Ajayi, Hungbo, & Adeyemi, 2019). By incorporating iterative cycles, these systems adapt to bandwidth restrictions, enabling the use of mobile-based diagnostics and remote consultations even in areas with limited connectivity. This reduces the dependency on physical infrastructure while simultaneously extending access to critical health services (Eneogu *et al.*, 2020).

Furthermore, digital health platforms benefit from agile’s stakeholder-driven approach, ensuring that local practitioners, patients, and policymakers co-create solutions that are contextually relevant. Agile deployment allows for rapid feedback loops, which enhance the accuracy of predictive analytics in disease monitoring and outbreak prevention (Atalor, 2019). Studies confirm that iterative agile models help address challenges such as fragmented supply chains and under-resourced healthcare facilities by embedding adaptability and responsiveness into deployment processes (Scott *et al.*, 2018) as seen in Table 2. This ensures not only efficiency but also sustainability in the delivery of digital healthcare services.

Table 2: Agile Deployment in Healthcare Technologies for Resource-Constrained Environments

Focus Area	Agile Contribution	Key Outcomes	Long-Term Benefits
Telemedicine Platforms	Incremental rollout with iterative testing and adaptation	Services tailored to bandwidth and connectivity limitations	Expanded access to remote consultations and mobile diagnostics
Digital Health Platforms	Stakeholder-driven development involving practitioners, patients, and policymakers	Solutions aligned with local needs and cultural contexts	Increased trust, adoption, and sustainability of health innovations
Predictive Analytics & Monitoring	Rapid feedback loops enhancing data accuracy	Improved disease monitoring and early outbreak detection	Strengthened public health resilience and preventive care
Healthcare Operations	Embedding adaptability into fragmented supply chains and under-resourced facilities	Enhanced responsiveness in addressing logistical and operational barriers	Long-term efficiency and sustainable service delivery

5.2. Education (e-learning platforms, digital literacy tools)

Agile deployment in education has played a central role in expanding access to digital literacy and e-learning platforms within underserved communities. Resource-constrained environments often face barriers such as insufficient ICT infrastructure and limited teacher capacity. Agile’s modular development cycles enable institutions to pilot low-cost e-learning initiatives, refine pedagogical tools, and scale up progressively as resources allow (Adeyelu, Ugochukwu, & Shonibare, 2020). The emphasis on user-centered design ensures that learners’ needs remain at the forefront, supporting the creation of inclusive and adaptive learning tools that accommodate diverse cultural and linguistic contexts (Akinrinoye *et al.*, 2020).

The iterative nature of agile also facilitates the development of real-time digital literacy tools, improving student engagement and retention in low-resource schools. By leveraging agile methodologies, developers can integrate

emerging pedagogical innovations with local realities, enhancing scalability while minimizing costs (Amos, Adeniyi, & Oluwatosin, 2014). Empirical studies highlight that agile-enabled e-learning fosters resilience during crises, such as pandemics, by providing flexible learning environments (Basak, Wotto, & Bélanger, 2018). This adaptability underscores the necessity of agile models in bridging digital divides across educational systems.

5.3. Public administration and service delivery

In public administration, agile deployment offers significant advantages for enhancing service delivery in environments constrained by bureaucracy, fiscal limitations, and outdated infrastructure. Agile’s emphasis on stakeholder engagement promotes transparency and co-creation in governance processes, improving the relevance and uptake of digital services (Ikponmwoba *et al.*, 2020). This has proven crucial in contexts where centralized systems fail to meet the diverse

needs of marginalized populations. By facilitating iterative development, agile models enable government agencies to introduce citizen-facing services progressively while testing for usability, reliability, and cultural appropriateness (Sobowale *et al.*, 2020).

The adaptability of agile frameworks further supports the digitization of financial governance and audit systems, ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements in low-capacity institutions (Olajide *et al.*, 2020). Agile methods reduce project failure rates by enabling administrators to respond quickly to emerging policy challenges without incurring prohibitive costs (Nwani, Abiola-Adams, Otokiti, & Ogeawuchi, 2020). Research demonstrates that adopting agile in governance enhances operational readiness and accountability, ensuring that limited resources are optimized while promoting inclusivity and resilience in service delivery (Conforto, Amaral, & da Silva, 2016).

5.4. Comparative insights across sectors

Comparing healthcare, education, and public administration reveals that while sectoral contexts differ, agile deployment consistently enables adaptability, inclusivity, and sustainability in resource-constrained environments. In healthcare, agile's iterative approach allows the rapid adjustment of telemedicine systems to overcome infrastructural deficiencies (Ozobu, 2020). In education, modular agile frameworks enhance the scalability of digital literacy platforms while reducing dependency on large-scale infrastructure investments (Akonobi & Okpokwu, 2020). Similarly, in governance, agile promotes participatory development and strengthens accountability, ensuring that citizen-centric services align with evolving community needs (Olasoji, Iziduh, & Adeyelu, 2020).

Despite these sectoral differences, the comparative insight underscores the unifying strength of agile deployment: its ability to deliver incremental value under uncertainty. Agile allows for experimentation, co-creation, and rapid adaptation, elements that mitigate risks and foster resilience across diverse domains (Okenwa, Uzozie, & Onaghinor, 2019). Evidence from multiple contexts shows that embedding agile practices enhances both efficiency and equity, making it a cross-sectoral imperative for technology deployment in resource-limited environments (Hoda, Noble, & Marshall, 2017).

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1. Summary of findings

This review underscores the significance of agile deployment models as practical and adaptive mechanisms for delivering technology solutions in resource-constrained environments. The findings highlight that traditional deployment models, while structured, often prove too rigid and resource-intensive for contexts marked by infrastructural deficiencies, financial limitations, and human capital shortages. Agile methodologies, by contrast, offer flexibility, iterative development, and continuous stakeholder engagement, enabling organizations to optimize scarce resources and respond effectively to evolving needs. Across sectors such as healthcare, education, and public administration, agile practices have demonstrated their potential to improve efficiency, reduce project risks, and foster inclusivity in design and implementation. Importantly, the analysis reveals that agile's incremental delivery model allows for measurable progress even under uncertain funding or volatile market

conditions. This adaptability positions agile not merely as a project management tool but as a strategic framework capable of bridging systemic gaps in technological access. By emphasizing modular deployments, user-centered innovation, and sustainability, agile offers a pathway toward more equitable and resilient technology integration in disadvantaged settings.

6.2. Proposed conceptual framework for agile deployment in resource-constrained environments

The proposed conceptual framework for agile deployment in resource-constrained environments rests on three interdependent pillars: adaptability, inclusivity, and sustainability. Adaptability ensures that projects remain resilient against external shocks by using iterative cycles, modular components, and incremental resource allocation. Inclusivity emphasizes the integration of diverse stakeholders throughout all stages of deployment, ensuring that solutions are contextually appropriate, culturally sensitive, and aligned with local needs. Sustainability involves embedding practices that minimize long-term risks, such as lightweight infrastructures, cost-effective tools, and progressive capacity building. Within the framework, feedback loops are central, linking each cycle of deployment to direct user input and organizational learning. This continuous improvement mechanism reduces waste, accelerates adoption, and enhances long-term viability. Moreover, the framework highlights the strategic use of open-source platforms, community partnerships, and low-cost innovations to overcome infrastructural deficits. By weaving these elements together, the conceptual framework reimagines agile not only as a technical methodology but as a holistic strategy for equitable technology integration. It situates agile as a dynamic system capable of evolving alongside the unique challenges of resource-constrained environments, ultimately fostering resilient and scalable solutions.

6.3. Policy, practice, and research implications

The implications of adopting agile deployment models in resource-constrained environments extend across policy, practice, and research domains. For policymakers, the framework provides a blueprint for designing supportive regulatory environments that encourage iterative experimentation, reduce bureaucratic barriers, and promote investment in modular infrastructures. Policies must prioritize inclusivity, ensuring that marginalized communities are active participants in technology initiatives rather than passive beneficiaries. In practice, organizations can leverage agile methods to enhance operational efficiency, reduce sunk costs, and cultivate user trust by embedding feedback-driven adaptation into deployment cycles. Practitioners should also emphasize capacity-building programs to equip local actors with the skills necessary for sustaining agile practices over time. For researchers, the framework opens new avenues for empirical inquiry, such as evaluating the long-term sustainability of agile deployments under fluctuating resources or exploring cross-sectoral applications in health, education, and governance. Additionally, further studies can investigate hybrid models that integrate agile with other methodologies to optimize outcomes in specific contexts. Overall, the implications stress the necessity of collaborative, adaptive, and evidence-based approaches, positioning agile deployment as a strategic instrument for equitable and sustainable technological

transformation in underserved environments.

7. References.

1. Abass OS, Balogun O, Didi PU. A predictive analytics framework for optimizing preventive healthcare sales and engagement outcomes. *IRE J.* 2019;2(11):497-503.
2. Abass OS, Balogun O, Didi PU. A multi-channel sales optimization model for expanding broadband access in emerging urban markets. *IRE J.* 2020;4(3):191-8.
3. Abass OS, Balogun O, Didi PU. A sentiment-driven churn management framework using CRM text mining and performance dashboards. *IRE J.* 2020;4(5):251-9.
4. Adelusi BS, Uzoka AC, Hassan YG, Ojika FU. Leveraging transformer-based large language models for parametric estimation of cost and schedule in agile software development projects. *IRE J.* 2020;4(4):267-73. doi:10.36713/epra1010.
5. Adeniyi Ajonbadi H, Aboaba Mojeed-Sanni B, Otokiti BO. Sustaining competitive advantage in medium-sized enterprises (MEs) through employee social interaction and helping behaviours. *J Small Bus Entrep.* 2015;3(2):1-16.
6. Adewusi BA, Adekunle BI, Mustapha SD, Uzoka AC. Advances in inclusive innovation strategy and gender equity through digital platform enablement in Africa. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
7. Adeyelu OO, Ugochukwu CE, Shonibare MA. AI-driven analytics for SME risk management in low-infrastructure economies: a review framework. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):193-200.
8. Adeyelu OO, Ugochukwu CE, Shonibare MA. Artificial intelligence and SME loan default forecasting: a review of tools and deployment barriers. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):211-20.
9. Adeyelu OO, Ugochukwu CE, Shonibare MA. The role of predictive algorithms in optimizing financial access for informal entrepreneurs. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):201-10.
10. Ajonbadi HA, Lawal AA, Badmus DA, Otokiti BO. Leadership and organisational performance in the Nigeria small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *Am J Bus Econ Manag.* 2014;36(2):124-38.
11. Ajonbadi HA, Otokiti BO, Adebayo P. The efficacy of planning on organisational performance in the Nigeria SMEs. *Eur J Bus Manag.* 2016;24(3):25-47.
12. Akinrinoye OV, Kufile OT, Otokiti BO, Ejike OG, Umezurike SA, Onifade AY. Customer segmentation strategies in emerging markets: a review of tools, models, and applications. *Int J Sci Res Comput Sci Eng Inf Technol.* 2020;6(1):194-217.
13. Akonobi AB, Okpokwu CO. Designing a customer-centric performance model for digital lending systems in emerging markets. *IRE J.* 2019;3(4):395-402.
14. Akonobi AB, Okpokwu CO. A cloud-native software innovation framework for scalable fintech product development and deployment. *IRE J.* 2020;4(3):211-8.
15. Akonobi AB, Okpokwu CO. A process reengineering framework for automating contact center operations using lean and agile principles. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):361-8.
16. Akonobi AB, Okpokwu CO. A value innovation model for enhancing customer experience in cloud-based retail and financial services. *IRE J.* 2020;3(11):443-51.
17. Akonobi AB, Okpokwu CO. Integrating consumer behavior models into bank-owned e-commerce strategy: a technical review. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval.* 2020;1(3):114-29. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.3.114-129.
18. Akpe OEE, Mgbame AC, Ogbuefi E, Abayomi AA, Adeyelu OO. Bridging the business intelligence gap in small enterprises: a conceptual framework for scalable adoption. *IRE J.* 2020;4(2):159-61.
19. Alahyari H, Berntsson Svensson R, Gorschek T. A study of value in agile software development organizations. *J Syst Softw.* 2017;125:271-88. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2016.12.007.
20. Amos AO, Adeniyi AO, Oluwatosin OB. Market based capabilities and results: inference for telecommunication service businesses in Nigeria. *Eur Sci J.* 2014;10(7).
21. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Strategic communication for inflight teams: closing expectation gaps in passenger experience delivery. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval.* 2020;1(1):183-94. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.1.183-194.
22. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Reframing passenger experience strategy: a predictive model for net promoter score optimization. *IRE J.* 2020;4(5):208-17. doi:10.9734/jmsor/2025/u8i1388.
23. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Benchmarking safety briefing efficacy in crew operations: a mixed-methods approach. *IRE J.* 2020;4(4):310-2.
24. Asata MN, Nyangoma D, Okolo CH. Leadership impact on cabin crew compliance and passenger satisfaction in civil aviation. *IRE J.* 2020;4(3):153-61.
25. Atalor SI. Federated learning architectures for predicting adverse drug events in oncology without compromising patient privacy. *IRE J.* 2019;2(12).
26. Atobatele OK, Ajayi OO, Hungbo AQ, Adeyemi C. Leveraging public health informatics to strengthen monitoring and evaluation of global health interventions. *IRE J.* 2019;2(7):174-82.
27. Atobatele OK, Hungbo AQ, Adeyemi C. Digital health technologies and real-time surveillance systems: transforming public health emergency preparedness through data-driven decision making. *IRE J.* 2019;3(9):417-25.
28. Atobatele OK, Hungbo AQ, Adeyemi C. Evaluating the strategic role of economic research in supporting financial policy decisions and market performance metrics. *IRE J.* 2019;2(10):442-50.
29. Atobatele OK, Hungbo AQ, Adeyemi C. Leveraging big data analytics for population health management: a comparative analysis of predictive modeling approaches in chronic disease prevention and healthcare resource optimization. *IRE J.* 2019;3(4):370-80.
30. Ayanbode N, Cadet E, Etim ED, Essien IA, Ajayi JO. Deep learning approaches for malware detection in large-scale networks. *IRE J.* 2019;3(1):483-502.
31. Babatunde LA, Etim ED, Essien IA, Cadet E, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, et al. Adversarial machine learning in cybersecurity: vulnerabilities and defense strategies. *J Front Multidiscip Res.* 2020;1(2):31-45. doi:10.54660/JFMR.2020.1.2.31-45.
32. Balogun O, Abass OS, Didi PU. A multi-stage brand repositioning framework for regulated FMCG markets in Sub-Saharan Africa. *IRE J.* 2019;2(8):236-42.
33. Balogun O, Abass OS, Didi PU. A behavioral conversion model for driving tobacco harm reduction through consumer switching campaigns. *IRE J.* 2020;4(2):348-55.

34. Balogun O, Abass OS, Didi PU. A market-sensitive flavor innovation strategy for e-cigarette product development in youth-oriented economies. *IRE J.* 2020;3(12):395-402.
35. Bankole AO, Nwokediegwu ZS, Okiye SE. Emerging cementitious composites for 3D printed interiors and exteriors: a materials innovation review. *J Front Multidiscip Res.* 2020;1(1):127-44.
36. Basak SK, Wotto M, Bélanger P. E-learning, M-learning and D-learning: conceptual definition and comparative analysis. *E-Learn Digit Media.* 2018;15(4):191-216. doi:10.1177/2042753018785180.
37. Beck K, Beedle M, van Bennekum A, Cockburn A, Cunningham W, Fowler M, *et al.* Manifesto for Agile Software Development. Agile Alliance; 2001. Available from: <https://agilemanifesto.org/>.
38. Bhatti Y, Basu R, Barron D, Ventresca M. Frugal innovation: models, means, methods. *Camb J Econ.* 2018;42(3):657-81. doi:10.1093/cje/bex067.
39. Bukhari TT, Oladimeji O, Etim ED, Ajayi JO. Advancing data culture in West Africa: a community-oriented framework for mentorship and job creation. *Int J Multidiscip Futuristic Dev.* 2020;1(2):1-18.
40. Conboy K, Carroll N. Implementing large-scale agile frameworks: challenges and recommendations. *IEEE Softw.* 2019;36(2):44-50. doi:10.1109/MS.2018.2884865.
41. Conforto E, Amaral DC, da Silva SL. Agile project management and stage-gate model—a hybrid framework for technology-based companies. *J Eng Technol Manag.* 2016;40:1-14. doi:10.1016/j.jengtecman.2016.02.003.
42. Conforto E, Salum F, Amaral D, da Silva S, de Almeida L. Can agile project management be adopted by industries other than software development? *Proj Manag J.* 2016;47(3):21-34. doi:10.1002/pmj.21536.
43. Dennehy D, Conboy K. Going with the flow: an activity theory analysis of agile software development practices. *J Syst Softw.* 2018;133:160-72. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2017.07.011.
44. Dennehy D, Conboy K. Breaking the flow: a study of contradictions in information systems agile practice. *Inf Technol People.* 2019;32(2):530-61. doi:10.1108/ITP-09-2017-0306.
45. Denning S. The age of agile: how smart companies are transforming the way work gets done. New York: AMACOM; 2018.
46. Didi PU, Abass OS, Balogun O. A multi-tier marketing framework for renewable infrastructure adoption in emerging economies. *IRE J.* 2019;3(4):337-45.
47. Didi PU, Abass OS, Balogun O. Integrating AI-augmented CRM and SCADA systems to optimize sales cycles in the LNG industry. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):346-54.
48. Didi PU, Abass OS, Balogun O. Leveraging geospatial planning and market intelligence to accelerate off-grid gas-to-power deployment. *IRE J.* 2020;3(10):481-9.
49. Dingsøyr T, Nerur S, Balijepally V, Moe NB. A decade of agile methodologies: towards explaining agile software development. *J Syst Softw.* 2012;85(6):1213-21. doi:10.1016/j.jss.2012.02.033.
50. Dybå T, Dingsøyr T. Agile project management: an empirical study of software development projects. *Inf Softw Technol.* 2015;58:1-15. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.2014.10.002.
51. Eneogu RA, Mitchell EM, Ogbudebe C, Aboki D, Anyebe V, Dimkpa CB, *et al.* Operationalizing mobile computer-assisted TB screening and diagnosis with Wellness on Wheels (WoW) in Nigeria: balancing feasibility and iterative efficiency. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
52. Erigha ED, Obuse E, Ayanbode N, Cadet E, Etim ED. Machine learning-driven user behavior analytics for insider threat detection. *IRE J.* 2019;2(11):535-44.
53. Essien IA, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, Obuse E, Ayanbode N. Federated learning models for privacy-preserving cybersecurity analytics. *IRE J.* 2020;3(9):493-9.
54. Essien IA, Cadet E, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, Obuse E. Cloud security baseline development using OWASP, CIS benchmarks, and ISO 27001 for regulatory compliance. *IRE J.* 2019;2(8):250-6.
55. Essien IA, Cadet E, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, Obuse E. Integrated governance, risk, and compliance framework for multi-cloud security and global regulatory alignment. *IRE J.* 2019;3(3):215-21.
56. Essien IA, Cadet E, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, Obuse E. Cyber risk mitigation and incident response model leveraging ISO 27001 and NIST for global enterprises. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):379-85.
57. Essien IA, Cadet E, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, Obuse E. Regulatory compliance monitoring system for GDPR, HIPAA, and PCI-DSS across distributed cloud architectures. *IRE J.* 2020;3(12):409-15.
58. Essien IA, Cadet E, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, Obuse E, Babatunde LA, *et al.* From manual to intelligent GRC: the future of enterprise risk automation. *IRE J.* 2020;3(12):421-8.
59. Etim ED, Essien IA, Ajayi JO, Erigha ED, Obuse E. AI-augmented intrusion detection: advancements in real-time cyber threat recognition. *IRE J.* 2019;3(3):225-31.
60. Evans-Uzosike IO, Okatta CG. Strategic human resource management: trends, theories, and practical implications. *Iconic Res Eng J.* 2019;3(4):264-70.
61. Eyinade W, Ezeilo OJ, Ogundeji IA. A treasury management model for predicting liquidity risk in dynamic emerging market energy sectors. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
62. Fasasi ST, Adebawale OJ, Abdulsalam A, Nwokediegwu ZQS. Benchmarking performance metrics of methane monitoring technologies in simulated environments. *Iconic Res Eng J.* 2019;3(3):193-202.
63. Fasasi ST, Adebawale OJ, Abdulsalam A, Nwokediegwu ZQS. Design framework for continuous monitoring systems in industrial methane surveillance. *Iconic Res Eng J.* 2020;4(1):280-8.
64. Fasasi ST, Adebawale OJ, Abdulsalam A, Nwokediegwu ZQS. Time-series modeling of methane emission events using machine learning forecasting algorithms. *IRE J.* 2020;4(4):337-46.
65. Fasasi ST, Adebawale OJ, Abdulsalam A, Nwokediegwu ZQS. Atmospheric plume dispersion modeling for methane quantification under variable conditions. *IRE J.* 2020;3(8):353-62.
66. Fiemotongha JE, Olajide JO, Otokiti BO, Nwani S, Ogunmokun AS, Adekunle BI. Designing integrated financial governance systems for waste reduction and inventory optimization. *IRE J.* 2020;3(10):382-90.
67. Fiemotongha JE, Olajide JO, Otokiti BO, Nwani S, Ogunmokun AS, Adekunle BI. Developing a financial analytics framework for end-to-end logistics and

- distribution cost control. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):253-61.
68. Fiore SM. Distributed collaboration in organizations: research insights to guide practice. *Hum Resour Manag Rev.* 2019;29(2):100672. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.02.001.
 69. Foster C, Azmeh S. Latecomer development in the age of digital platforms: policy perspectives on technology infrastructure in Africa. *Dev Policy Rev.* 2020;38(5):675-95. doi:10.1111/dpr.12467.
 70. Gbenle TP, Akpe Ejielo OE, Owoade S, Ubanadu BC, Daraojimba AI. A conceptual model for cross functional collaboration between IT and business units in cloud projects. *IRE J.* 2020;4(6):99-114.
 71. Hoda R, Noble J, Marshall S. Agile under adversity: evolution of a software development team. *Inf Softw Technol.* 2017;56(1):6-20. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.2013.06.005.
 72. Hoda R, Noble J, Marshall S. The impact of inadequate customer collaboration on self-organizing agile teams. *Inf Softw Technol.* 2017;88:20-30. doi:10.1016/j.infsof.2017.03.006.
 73. Ikponmwoba SO, Chima OK, Ezeilo OJ, Ojonugwa BM, Ochefu A, Adesuyi MO. Conceptual framework for improving bank reconciliation accuracy using intelligent audit controls. *J Front Multidiscip Res.* 2020;1(1):57-70. doi:10.54660/IJFMR.2020.1.1.57-70.
 74. Ikponmwoba SO, Chima OK, Ezeilo OJ, Ojonugwa BM, Ochefu A, Adesuyi MO. A compliance-driven model for enhancing financial transparency in local government accounting systems. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval.* 2020;1(2):99-108. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.2.99-108.
 75. Ilufoye H, Akinrinoye OV, Okolo CH. A conceptual model for sustainable profit and loss management in large-scale online retail. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval.* 2020;1(3):107-13.
 76. Ilufoye H, Akinrinoye OV, Okolo CH. A scalable infrastructure model for digital corporate social responsibility in underserved school systems. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval.* 2020;3:100. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.
 77. Ilufoye H, Akinrinoye OV, Okolo CH. A strategic product innovation model for launching digital lending solutions in financial technology. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval.* 2020;3:93. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.
 78. James T, Hinson RE, Agyei SK. Internet diffusion in sub-Saharan Africa: a cross-country analysis. *Telecomm Policy.* 2019;43(5):411-25. doi:10.1016/j.telpol.2018.11.007.
 79. Menson WNA, Olawepo JO, Bruno T, Gbadamosi SO, Nalda NF, Anyebe V, *et al.* Reliability of self-reported mobile phone ownership in rural north-central Nigeria: cross-sectional study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2018;6(3):e8760.
 80. Mgbame AC, Akpe OEE, Abayomi AA, Ogbuefi E, Adeyelu OO. Barriers and enablers of BI tool implementation in underserved SME communities. *IRE J.* 2020;3(7):211-3.
 81. Morgan L. Toward a theory of agile project governance: a research agenda. *J Inf Technol.* 2016;31(2):149-71. doi:10.1057/jit.2016.4.
 82. Mwaura S. Financing digital innovation in emerging markets: barriers and opportunities. *Technol Forecast Soc Change.* 2021;164:120509. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120509.
 83. Nwaimo CS, Oluoha OM, Oyedokun O. Big data analytics: technologies, applications, and future prospects. *IRE J.* 2019;2(11):411-9. doi:10.46762/IRECEE/2019.51123.
 84. Nwani S, Abiola-Adams O, Otokiti BO, Ogeawuchi JC. Building operational readiness assessment models for micro, small, and medium enterprises seeking government-backed financing. *J Front Multidiscip Res.* 2020;1(1):38-43. doi:10.54660/IJFMR.2020.1.1.38-43.
 85. Nwani S, Abiola-Adams O, Otokiti BO, Ogeawuchi JC. Designing inclusive and scalable credit delivery systems using AI-powered lending models for underserved markets. *IRE J.* 2020;4(1):212-4. doi:10.34293/irejournals.v4i1.1708888.
 86. Nwokediegwu ZS, Bankole AO, Okiye SE. Advancing interior and exterior construction design through large-scale 3D printing: a comprehensive review. *IRE J.* 2019;3(1):422-49.
 87. Odinaka N, Okolo CH, Chima OK, Adeyelu OO. AI-enhanced market intelligence models for global data center expansion: strategic framework for entry into emerging markets. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
 88. Odinaka N, Okolo CH, Chima OK, Adeyelu OO. Data-driven financial governance in energy sector audits: a framework for enhancing SOX compliance and cost efficiency. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
 89. Okenwa OK, Uzozie OT, Onaghinor O. Supply chain risk management strategies for mitigating geopolitical and economic risks. *IRE J.* 2019;2(9):242-50.
 90. Oladuji TJ, Nwangele CR, Onifade O, Akintobi AO. Advancements in financial forecasting models: using AI for predictive business analysis in emerging economies. *Iconic Res Eng J.* 2020;4(4):223-36.
 91. Olajide JO, Otokiti BO, Nwani S, Ogunmokun AS, Adekunle BI, Efekpogua J. Designing integrated financial governance systems for waste reduction and inventory optimization. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
 92. Olajide JO, Otokiti BO, Nwani S, Ogunmokun AS, Adekunle BI, Efekpogua J. Developing a financial analytics framework for end-to-end logistics and distribution cost control. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
 93. Olajide JO, Otokiti BO, Nwani S, Ogunmokun AS, Adekunle BI, Efekpogua J. Designing a financial planning framework for managing SLOB and write-off risk in fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG). [No journal title provided]. 2020.
 94. Olasoji O, Iziduh EF, Adeyelu OO. A cash flow optimization model for aligning vendor payments and capital commitments in energy projects. *IRE J.* 2020;3(10):403-4. doi:10.54660/irejournals.v3i10.1709383.
 95. Olasoji O, Iziduh EF, Adeyelu OO. A regulatory reporting framework for strengthening SOX compliance and audit transparency in global finance operations. *IRE J.* 2020;4(2):240-1. doi:10.54660/irejournals.v4i2.1709385.
 96. Olasoji O, Iziduh EF, Adeyelu OO. A strategic framework for enhancing financial control and planning in multinational energy investment entities. *IRE J.* 2020;3(11):412-3. doi:10.54660/irejournals.v3i11.1707384.

97. Onifade O, Eyeregba ME, Ezech FS. A conceptual framework for enhancing grant compliance through digital process mapping and visual reporting tools. *IRE J.* 2020;3(9).
98. Otokiti BO. A study of management practices and organisational performance of selected MNCs in emerging market—a case of Nigeria. *Int J Bus Manag Invent.* 2017;6(6):1-7.
99. Otokiti BO. Social media and business growth of women entrepreneurs in Ilorin metropolis. *Int J Entrep Bus Manag.* 2017;1(2):50-65.
100. Otokiti BO, Akorede AF. Advancing sustainability through change and innovation: a co-evolutionary perspective. In: *Innovation: taking creativity to the market. Book of Readings in Honour of Professor SO Otokiti.* 2018;1(1):161-7.
101. Ozobu CO. A predictive assessment model for occupational hazards in petrochemical maintenance and shutdown operations. *Iconic Res Eng J.* 2020;3(10):391-6.
102. Ozobu CO. Modeling exposure risk dynamics in fertilizer production plants using multi-parameter surveillance frameworks. *Iconic Res Eng J.* 2020;4(2):227-32.
103. Scholten J, Eneogu R, Ogbudebe C, Nsa B, Anozie I, Anyebe V, *et al.* Ending the TB epidemic: role of active TB case finding using mobile units for early diagnosis of tuberculosis in Nigeria. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis.* 2018;11:22.
104. Scott RE, Mars M, Jordanova M. Would a digital health platform work in low-resource settings? *Int J Med Inform.* 2018;114:92-7. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2018.03.001.
105. Sharma A, Adekunle BI, Ogeawuchi JC, Abayomi AA, Onifade O. IoT-enabled predictive maintenance for mechanical systems: innovations in real-time monitoring and operational excellence. [No journal title provided]. 2019.
106. Sobowale A, Ikponmwoba SO, Chima OK, Ezeilo OJ, Ojonugwa BM, Adesuyi MO. A conceptual framework for integrating SOX-compliant financial systems in multinational corporate governance. *Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval.* 2020;1(2):88-98. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2020.1.2.88-98.
107. Stol KJ, Fitzgerald B. The ABC of software engineering research. *ACM Trans Softw Eng Methodol.* 2018;27(3):1-51. doi:10.1145/3241743.
108. Uzoka C, Adekunle BI, Mustapha SD, Adewusi BA. Advances in low-code and no-code platform engineering for scalable product development in cross-sector environments. [No journal title provided]. 2020.
109. Uzozie OT, Onaghinor O, Okenwa OK. The influence of big data analytics on supply chain decision-making. *IRE J.* 2019;3(2):754-63.
110. Valli C, Hannay P, Jøsang A. Security in agile digital government: balancing agility and control. *Gov Inf Q.* 2019;36(2):223-31. doi:10.1016/j.giq.2019.02.004.
111. VersionOne. 11th annual State of Agile report. VersionOne; 2017. Available from: <https://stateofagile.com>.