

AKSU Journal of Social Sciences
(AKSUJOSS)
ISSN: 2504 – 933X
Vol.8,No.1 (September) 2026,pp.87-99
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61090/aksujoss.8.1.87-99
URL: htpp://www.aksujournal.com/vol.8.1
Received: April 20, 2026
Accepted: August 3, 2026
Published Online: September 1, 202

Innovation Strategy and Strategic Partnerships as Drivers of Product Development Performance in Technology-Based Firms

Sunday Adeniyi Olasehinde
Department of Business Administration
Faculty of Management Sciences, Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Ekiti State
Sunday.olasehinde@fuoye.edu.ng, 08066428627

Israel Ehimare Ogbebor
Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Nigeria
Israelogbebor8@gmail.com, 09028178872

Abstract

This study examined the effects of innovation strategy and strategic partnerships on product development performance in technology-based firms, using Paystack as a case study. The research specifically assessed how internal innovation capability, R&D investment, and collaborative networks influence product development performance. The study design used was a descriptive survey. Structured questionnaires were used to gather primary data from 250 employees at Paystack's Lagos office. 226 valid responses, or 90.4% of the total, were obtained. Multiple regression analysis and descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were used to analyze the data. The results showed that all constructs, internal innovation capabilities (mean = 4.27), R&D investment (mean = 4.18), collaborative networks (mean = 4.33), and product development success (mean = 4.34), were strongly favored. The three factors together accounted for 65.9% of the variance in product development performance, according to multiple regression results ($R = 0.812$, $R^2 = 0.659$, $p = 0.000$). All three hypotheses were rejected at the 0.05 significance level. Collaborative networks had the strongest influence ($\beta = 0.421$, $p = 0.000$), followed by internal innovation capability ($\beta = 0.378$, $p = 0.000$) and R&D investment ($\beta = 0.271$, $p = 0.000$). The study concludes that a balanced integration of strong internal innovation capabilities, sustained R&D investment, and effective collaborative networks is critical for achieving superior product development performance in technology-based firms operating in emerging markets. It is recommended that Paystack and similar fintech companies continue strengthening internal innovation routines, protect long-term R&D budgets, and expand high-value strategic partnerships. The findings provide practical insights for technology firms and contribute to the literature on innovation management and strategic alliances in developing economies.

Keywords: Innovation strategy, strategic partnerships, product development performance, technology-based firms.

1. Introduction

Product development performance is a critical determinant of competitiveness in technology-based companies, reflecting their ability to transform innovative ideas into high-quality, scalable, and customer-oriented products within a reasonable time. Strong product development enables firms to respond effectively to changing market demands, improve operational efficiency, and sustain competitive advantage. Achieving this performance requires a well-defined innovation strategy that promotes continuous learning, rapid experimentation, and the adoption of emerging technologies while aligning product offerings with customer needs and market trends (Iheanachor, 2021; Omoregbe, 2023). Strategic partnerships further complement internal innovation by providing access to external resources, technical expertise, regulatory support, and wider market opportunities, thereby accelerating product development and commercialization (Okoro, 2021; Babatunde, 2021). In Nigeria's fintech industry, where regulatory uncertainty, infrastructural constraints, and intense competition persist, the integration of innovation strategy and strategic partnerships has become essential for enhancing product development performance and long-term sustainability (Ekezie, 2023; Oladipo, 2022).

Despite Paystack's remarkable growth through innovative payment solutions and strategic collaborations, including its acquisition by Stripe, the company has recently encountered regulatory sanctions, legal disputes, and compliance challenges that may affect its product development capabilities and future growth (Lunden, 2020; Viridian, 2024). Existing studies have largely examined innovation and fintech performance separately, with limited empirical attention to how innovation strategy and strategic partnerships jointly influence product development performance in Paystack. This study aims to close this gap by looking into the combined effects of innovation strategy and strategic alliances on Paystack's product development performance.

Objectives of the Study

The primary goal of this research is to investigate the effects of innovation strategy and strategic partnerships on the product development performance of technology-based enterprises, with Paystack as a case study. Specific aims are to:

1. Assess how internal innovation capability influences product development performance in technology-based firms.
2. Evaluate the effect of R&D investment on product development performance in technology-based firms.
3. Examine how collaborative networks contribute to product development performance in technology-based firms.

2. Literature Review

Conceptual Review

Innovation Strategy

Innovation strategy is the purposeful planning and coordination of organizational actions that encourage the development, selection, and implementation of new goods, services, processes, and business models to gain a long-term competitive edge. According to Jain (2023), it acts as a strategic guide, directing organizational resources, competencies, and external collaborations toward innovation. It incorporates innovation into the company's entire business strategy by defining innovation objectives, allocating resources, managing innovation portfolios, and cultivating an innovative culture. Effective innovation strategy also promotes leadership support, experimentation, cross-functional collaboration, governance, and performance measurement through key performance indicators (Jain, 2023). Furthermore, organizations increasingly incorporate external partnerships with customers, suppliers, universities, and research institutions to enhance innovation outcomes. Different innovation approaches, including incremental, radical, disruptive, and architectural innovation, are selected based on organizational objectives.

Innovation Capability

Innovation capability refers to an organization's ability to constantly turn ideas, knowledge, and resources

into valuable goods, services, processes, or systems that improve performance and competitiveness (Saunila & Ukko, 2012; Lawson & Samson, 2001). It brings together strategic resources, organizational routines, leadership, and learning skills to help businesses discover opportunities and respond effectively to environmental changes (El Hanchi & Kerzazi, 2020). Leadership, organizational culture, knowledge management, and cross-functional collaboration are essential for strengthening innovation capability, while national innovation systems also influence organizational innovation performance (WIPO, 2024).

Strategic Partnerships

Strategic partnerships are long-term collaborative relationships between independent organizations established to create mutual value, share resources, reduce risks, and enhance competitive advantage (Sroka & Cygler, 2021). Unlike transactional relationships, strategic partnerships emphasize trust, shared goals, coordinated decision-making, and knowledge exchange. Organizations increasingly rely on partnerships with suppliers, customers, universities, governments, and technology firms to strengthen innovation capabilities and respond to rapidly changing business environments (Zhang & Chen, 2022). Through knowledge sharing, firms combine complementary expertise to improve innovation performance and organizational learning (Hameed et al., 2021). Effective partnerships depend on trust, strategic alignment, governance structures, and continuous communication, which promote long-term collaboration and reduce conflicts (Ali et al., 2024; Chen & Lee, 2022). Strategic partnerships also facilitate digital transformation, sustainability initiatives, SME development, and risk sharing during economic uncertainty (Veleva & Bodkin, 2021; Adegbite & Rahman, 2023; Marquez & Silva, 2022). Consequently, they remain essential instruments for innovation, organizational resilience, and sustainable competitive performance.

Research and Development (R&D) investment refers to the allocation of financial, human, and technological resources toward scientific research, technological advancement, product development, and innovation activities that strengthen organizational competitiveness (García-Sánchez & Aibar-Guzmán, 2021). Strategic R&D investment enhances firms' technological capabilities, supports innovation, and enables organizations to respond proactively to changing market conditions (Kang & Park, 2022). Research shows that R&D investment improves innovation capability by increasing patent generation, absorptive capacity, and knowledge sharing through collaborations with universities and research institutions (Fernández-Serrano et al., 2023; Rao & Dutta, 2023). It also contributes to higher productivity, profitability, export performance, and long-term organizational resilience (Diaz-Chao et al., 2021; Mensah & Osei, 2024). Effective R&D requires strategic alignment, sound governance, project management, and innovation-supportive cultures to maximize returns (Cheng & Wu, 2021).

Product development performance refers to an organization's ability to efficiently transform ideas into successful products by balancing speed, quality, cost, innovation, customer satisfaction, and market success (Berényi, 2022). Performance is evaluated using operational indicators such as time-to-market, development cost, product quality, and commercial measures including sales growth, market share, and customer acceptance. High product development performance depends on effective cross-functional collaboration, structured development processes, portfolio management, customer involvement, and organizational learning (Knudsen et al., 2023; Idrees, 2023). External factors such as market dynamics, regulatory requirements, and strategic partnerships also influence development outcomes, requiring organizations to adopt flexible and context-specific product development approaches (Phongthiya, 2024). Recent studies emphasize balanced performance measurement using both leading and lagging indicators aligned with organizational strategy (Blais, 2023). Organizations that integrate agile practices, digital technologies, innovation capability, continuous learning, and effective risk management consistently achieve superior product development outcomes and maintain long-term competitiveness (Tian et al., 2021; Berényi, 2022).

Theoretical Reviews

The Resource-Based View (RBV), established by Barney (1991), explains how organizations gain a sustained competitive advantage through valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources. Unlike market-based approaches, RBV views internal resources like as technology capabilities,

talented personnel, organizational knowledge, innovation capability, and financial assets as the major drivers of excellent performance. Innovation capability, aided by research and development (R&D), allows businesses to create distinctive goods and efficiently respond to changing client needs (Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993). Investment in R&D increases absorptive capacity, allowing businesses to acquire and apply new information for a competitive advantage (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). RBV also recognizes the importance of organizational culture, managerial expertise, learning, and knowledge sharing as difficult-to-imitate resources that enhance innovation (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Ultimately, firms achieve superior product development performance by effectively deploying their internal resources in alignment with strategic objectives (Grant, 1991; Teece et al., 1997).

RBV provides the theoretical foundation for examining how internal resources such as innovation

capability, R&D investment, skilled employees, and technological expertise influence product development performance in technology-based firms like Paystack. Teece et al. (1997) proposed Dynamic Capabilities Theory, which builds on the Resource-Based View by highlighting a firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external resources in response to changing surroundings. The theory emphasizes three key processes: detecting opportunities, grabbing them through effective resource allocation, and modifying organizational capacities to maintain competitiveness (Teece et al., 1997; Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). Dynamic capabilities encourage ongoing learning, knowledge management, organizational adaptation, and innovation, allowing businesses to create new products and adjust quickly to technology developments (Zahra et al., 2006). The theory also emphasizes the value of strategic collaborations, which give complementary knowledge and resources to boost innovation and shorten product development cycles. Firms possessing strong dynamic capabilities consistently demonstrate superior innovation performance, faster product launches, and improved responsiveness to market changes compared to firms relying solely on static resources (Teece, 2007). Dynamic Capabilities Theory is relevant because it explains how technology-based firms combine innovation capability, R&D investment, and strategic partnerships to improve product development performance.

Network Theory emphasizes that organizational performance is enhanced through relationships, collaborations, and strategic alliances that provide access to valuable knowledge, technology, and complementary resources (Granovetter, 1973; Powell, 1990). Rather than relying solely on internal capabilities, firms leverage external networks involving suppliers, universities, research institutions, and technology partners to improve innovation and product development (Powell et al., 1996). Strong network relationships promote trust, collaboration, and the exchange of tacit knowledge, whereas weak ties allow access to a variety of information and new opportunities (Granovetter, 1973). Strategic collaborations also allow firms to share risks, save development costs, expedite innovation, and shorten time-to-market (Gulati 1998). Furthermore, organizations with strong network linkages have higher absorptive capacity, which allows them to effectively learn and utilize external knowledge (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Chesbrough, 2003). As a result, network theory describes how external collaborations increase innovation capabilities and improve product development performance.

Empirical Reviews

The empirical literature consistently demonstrates that internal innovation capability, research and development (R&D) investment, and collaborative networks are significant drivers of product development performance in technology-based firms. Evidence indicates that organizations with strong internal innovation capabilities, including learning orientation, technological competence, knowledge management, and resource reconfiguration, are more successful in developing innovative products, improving operational efficiency, and sustaining competitive advantage (Yang & Sheu, 2016; Zhou et al., 2022). Furthermore, systematic reviews show that knowledge management, R&D capability, and organizational learning enhance firms' innovation outcomes and long-term adaptability, particularly when supported by sustainability-oriented innovation practices. Similarly, empirical studies reveal that R&D investment contributes positively to product innovation, productivity, profitability, and overall organizational performance.

However, these benefits are influenced by complementary organizational factors such as governance quality, financing availability, firm size, and effective internal control systems (Ngo et al., 2022; Lu, 2025; Wang et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2024). Likewise, collaborative networks and strategic partnerships improve product development by facilitating knowledge sharing, access to complementary resources, innovation risk-sharing, and accelerated product commercialization. Recent evidence further confirms that open innovation and strategic collaboration significantly strengthen firms' innovation performance and competitive advantage. Despite these contributions, important gaps remain. Most previous studies examined internal innovation capability, R&D investment, and collaborative networks independently using cross-sectional research designs, with limited attention to their combined effects on product development performance. In addition, empirical evidence from digital-native and fintech firms in emerging economies remains scarce. Consequently, this study addresses these gaps by investigating the combined influence of internal innovation capability, R&D investment, and collaborative networks on product development performance, using Paystack Nigeria.

3. Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design to examine the influence of internal innovation capability, R&D investment, and collaborative networks on product development performance in technology-based firms, using Paystack Payments Limited, Lagos, Nigeria, as the study area. Paystack was selected because of its strong innovation culture, strategic partnerships, and leadership in Nigeria's fintech industry. The study population comprised 250 employees drawn from key departments, including Engineering, Product Development, R&D and Innovation, Business Operations, Strategic Partnerships, Customer Support, and Finance/Compliance. Since the population was relatively small, a census approach was adopted, while stratified random sampling ensured proportional departmental representation.

Primary data were gathered via a standardized questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale, while secondary data were sourced from academic journals, textbooks, fintech studies, and Paystack publications. The instrument's content, concept, and face validity were determined by expert evaluation and adaptation of validated measurement scales. A pilot investigation employing Cronbach's alpha confirmed reliability, with coefficients for all constructs exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70. The study specified a multiple regression model in which Product Development Performance (PDP) served as the dependent variable, while Internal Innovation Capability (IIC), R&D Investment (RDI), and Collaborative Networks (CN) were the independent variables:

$$PDP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 IIC + \beta_2 RDI + \beta_3 CN + \varepsilon$$

Following informed agreement from respondents, questionnaires were administered both physically and electronically. The data was analyzed using IBM SPSS Version 25, with descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, averages, and standard deviations) and inferential statistics (Pearson correlation, multiple regression, and ANOVA) at a 5% significance level ($p < 0.05$). Diagnostic tests were carried out to validate the regression analysis assumptions. Ethical standards were followed by assuring voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity, safe data processing, and receiving ethical permission from the appropriate institutional ethics committee.

4.0 Results and Discussion

Questionnaire Administration and Response Rate

Table 4.1: Response Rate

Questionnaire Item	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Distributed	250	100.0
Valid Responses Retrieved	226	90.4
Invalid/Unreturned	24	9.6
Total	**250**	**100.0**

Source: Field Survey, 2026

As indicated in Table 4.1, out of the 250 questionnaires sent to Paystack employees, 226 were found valid and usable for analysis, with a high response rate of 90.4%. There were only 24 questionnaires that were not returned or invalid (9.6%). The response rate of 90.4 % is very high for organisational surveys and reflects the level of cooperation and interest by the respondents in the survey. This high rate greatly improves the confidence, representativeness, and generalizability of the results in the Paystack context. It also minimises non-response bias, meaning that opinions reported are representative of employee opinion in key departments dealing with innovation and product development.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 4.2: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=226)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	132	58.4
	Female	94	41.6
Age Group	25–34 years	98	43.4
	35–44 years	87	38.5
	45 years and above	41	18.1
Educational Qualification	Bachelor's Degree	112	49.6
	Master's Degree / Professional	98	43.4
	Others	16	7.1
Department	Engineering/Technology	52	23.0
	Product Development	48	21.2
	R&D and Innovation	35	15.5
	Business Operations	41	18.1
	Partnerships/Regulatory	28	12.4
	Others	22	9.7
Years of Experience	1–2 years	45	19.9
	3–5 years	98	43.4
	Above 5 years	83	36.7

Source: Field Survey, 2026

Table 4.2 shows the demographic features of the 226 respondents, demonstrating that the sample is appropriate for the study. The gender distribution was fairly balanced, with 58.4% male and 41.6% female responders, ensuring a variety of viewpoints. The majority of respondents (81.9%) were between the ages of 25 and 44, indicating an economically active and technologically oriented workforce actively engaged in innovation and product development. The respondents were also highly educated, with 93.0% having at least a bachelor's degree and 43.4% having a master's or professional certification, implying that they were aware enough to provide reliable answers on innovation strategy, R&D investment, and collaborative networks. Employees were chosen from all key functional divisions, including Engineering/Technology, Product Development, Business Operations, and R&D/Innovation, to ensure a thorough representation of departments directly involved in innovation activities. Furthermore, 80.1% of respondents had worked at Paystack for more than three years, indicating substantial organizational experience and a sound understanding of the firm's innovation, partnership, and product development processes.

Analysis of Research Questions

Table 4.3: Internal Innovation Capability (IIC)

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.

Highly developed technical routines for ideation	4.28	0.72
Cross-functional alignment for rapid prototyping	4.35	0.68
Culture encourages risk-taking and learning from failure	4.19	0.81
Administrative flexibility for experimentation	4.22	0.75
Effective internal knowledge management	4.31	0.69
	4.27	**0.73**

Source: Research Computations, 2026

The respondents' impression of Paystack's internal innovation potential was very good, with an overall mean score of 4.27 and a standard deviation of 0.73. This high mean score is much higher than the neutral (3.0) score, indicating that employees are generally satisfied with the company's strong internal systems and processes that encourage innovation. In the individual items, cross-functional alignment for rapid prototyping had the highest mean score (4.35) with a standard deviation of 0.68, indicating a high level of agreement that cross-functional collaboration (e.g., engineering, design, operations) is critical for rapid prototyping and testing new ideas.

Effective internal knowledge management came in as a close second at a mean of 4.31, indicating the firm has appropriate internal processes to capture, share and use knowledge on various product initiatives. The highly developed proportion of the Technical routines for Ideation was also found to be highly scored with a mean of 4.28, indicating confidence in the company's structured processes for continuous ideation. The mean was 4.22 for administrative flexibility for testing and experimenting, meaning that staff feel they have a reasonable degree of flexibility with respect to the use of new approaches and tools. The culture that encourages risk-taking and learning from failure had a mean of 4.19, which was still high but the relatively lowest of all items and was somewhat less agreed upon by the culture as compared to the other items.

Table 4.4: R&D Investment (RDI)

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Competitive percentage of revenue allocated to R&D	4.15	0.79
Substantial capital for testing infrastructure	4.28	0.74
Consistent investment in talent training	4.24	0.71
Funding for long-term exploratory research	4.12	0.83
R&D spending protected from short-term constraints	4.09	0.85
	4.18	**0.78**

Source: Research Computations, 2026

Respondents had a very good attitude towards Paystack's investment in R&D, with an overall mean score of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 0.78. A high number for this mean score indicates that employees are reasonably optimistic that the company invests a considerable amount of its resources in research and development. The mean score of 4.28 with a standard deviation of 0.74 indicated a high level of agreement that the organization has made significant investments in modern testing infrastructure and developer-friendly technology platforms. The mean of talent training and developer upskilling was 4.24 and consistent, indicating that the organization may continue to spend in the growth of its technical human resources. The mean scores for a competitive percentage of revenue dedicated to R&D and for funding of long-term exploratory research for platform optimization were 4.15 and 4.12, respectively. The mean for R&D spending was 4.09 with a high SD of 0.85, suggesting a lower degree of consensus in this dimension than the other dimensions of R&D, with more variation.

Table 4.5: Collaborative Networks (CN)

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Alliances with global providers accelerate capabilities	4.41	0.65
Collaboration with banks bridges infrastructure gaps	4.36	0.70

Broad ecosystem connections	4.29	0.68
High trust lowers transaction costs	4.33	0.67
Linkages with regulators for compliance	4.25	0.74
	4.33	**0.69**

Source: Research Computations, 2026

The overall mean score obtained by respondents for the collaborative networks with Paystack was 4.33 with SD score of 0.69 indicating a very strong positive perception. This high mean rating represents high agreement about the company's effective use of external partnerships and alliances as a support for operations and innovation. The most positive mean score was achieved with strategic alliances with global infrastructure providers like Stripe, with respondents strongly agreeing that they support the company's local product engineering. The score of Collaboration with domestic banks and card networks, which fills in critical local infrastructure gaps, was close behind with the mean score of 4.36. The mean score for high relational trust with external network partners on transaction costs and joint product launches was 4.33 and the mean score for broad ecosystem connections was 4.29. A mean of 4.25 was given for linkages with industry observers and regulatory taskforces for proactive compliance management.

Table 4.6: Product Development Performance (PDP)

Statement	Mean	Std. Dev.
Products meet high reliability and user satisfaction	4.38	0.66
Superior speed-to-market	4.32	0.71
Strong scalability	4.45	0.62
Rapid merchant adoption	4.29	0.68
High frequency of successful rollouts	4.26	0.73
	4.34	**0.68**

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The aggregate mean score of respondents' perceptions of Paystack's product development performance was 4.34 with a standard deviation of 0.68, indicating that Paystack's product development performance is very strongly favorable. This high mean score demonstrates widespread agreement that the company consistently produces excellent results in terms of product development. The highest mean found was for Strong scalability of constructed products, with a mean of 4.45 and a standard deviation of 0.62, showing that respondents are very confident in Paystack's products' capacity to handle massive numbers of transactions without compromising performance. The average scores for items with excellent reliability, user happiness, and improved speed-to-market were 4.38 and 4.32, respectively. The mean for rapid adoption of products just launched to merchants was 4.29 and the mean for frequency of successful and compliant feature adoption was 4.26.

4.5 Test of Hypotheses

Multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses.

Table 4.7: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.812[a]	.659	.654	.512

Table 4.8: ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	142.87	3	47.62	181.45	.000[b]
Residual	58.23	222	0.262		
Total	201.10	225			

Table 4.9: Coefficients

Variable	Unstandardized B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.682	0.214	-	3.19	.002
Internal Innovation Capability (IIC)	0.412	0.068	0.378	6.06	.000
R&D Investment (RDI)	0.295	0.059	0.271	5.00	.000
Collaborative Networks (CN)	0.467	0.072	0.421	6.49	.000

Source: SPSS Output, 2026

The three independent variables: internal innovation capability, R&D investment, and collaborative networks, collectively have a strong and statistically significant impact on the Paystack company's product development performance, according to the results of the multiple regression analysis. According to the model summary results, the three independent variables accounted for 65.9% of the variation in the product development performance, with an adjusted R Square of 0.654 and a multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.812 and R Square of 0.659. According to the ANOVA table, the model as a whole is statistically significant ($F = 181.45$, $p = 0.000$), meaning that all of the variables are important in predicting changes in the dependent variable.

With a standardized beta coefficient of 0.421 ($t = 6.49$, $p = 0.000$), collaborative networks made the largest unique contribution. Internal innovation capability came in second with a beta coefficient of 0.378 ($t = 6.06$, $p = 0.000$), and R&D investment came in last with a beta coefficient of 0.271 ($t = 5.00$, $p = 0.000$). At the 5% level, each of the three predictors is statistically significant. The findings demonstrated that the effectiveness of product development at Paystack can be explained by all three factors, stronger internal innovation capabilities, frequent R&D investments, and collaborative networks, with collaborative networks having the biggest impact.

Decision on Hypotheses:

- **H_1:** Rejected ($\beta = 0.378$, $p = 0.000$) – Internal innovation capability has a significant positive effect on product development performance.
- **H_2:** Rejected ($\beta = 0.271$, $p = 0.000$) – R&D investment has a significant positive influence on product development performance.
- **H_3:** Rejected ($\beta = 0.421$, $p = 0.000$) – Collaborative networks have a significant positive effect on product development performance.

Discussion of Findings

The results show that Paystack's product development performance is greatly improved by innovation strategy and strategic alliances. Product development performance was strongly positively impacted by internal innovation capabilities, indicating that cross-functional cooperation, innovation culture, and efficient knowledge management enhance product quality and innovation outcomes. The Resource-Based View and Dynamic Capabilities Theory, which highlight the strategic importance of internal organizational capabilities, are supported by this conclusion (Barney, 1991; Teece et al., 1997). According to Ngo et al. (2022) and Wang et al. (2022), persistent investment in research, technology, and personnel development boosts innovation and competitive advantage. R&D expenditure also had a strong positive influence on product development performance. The best predictor of product development effectiveness was shown to be collaborative networks, underscoring the significance of strategic partnerships in promoting resource sharing, information exchange, and quicker innovation (Hindi & Frenkel, 2022; Zhang et al., 2023). Overall, the study demonstrates that combining R&D funding, internal innovation capacity, and cooperative networks offers a thorough approach to enhancing product development performance in technology-based businesses, especially in Nigeria's fintech industry.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study has found four key factors that are important to Paystack's superior product development performance: strategy of innovation, effective strategic partnerships in the form of collaborative networks, strong internal innovation capability, and consistent R&D investment. The company has successfully developed a powerful innovation ecosystem which enables it to prototype quickly, record knowledge, scale product architecture, and attain high merchant adoption rates. The most significant variable studied was collaborative networks, which underscores the strategic role of partnerships like collaborations with Stripe and financial institutions in improving product engineering capabilities and addressing Java platform infrastructure and regulatory hurdles in the Nigerian fintech sector.

The results overall support the notion that technology-based companies in dynamic emerging markets, such as Nigeria, can deliver remarkable product development results when they master their internal innovation efforts, and manage their external collaborative networks appropriately. Paystack is an example of such synergy, which helps to quicken the time to market, enhance product reliability, enable scalability, and drive commercial success.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Paystack should continue to build its in-house innovation muscle by further infusing the company with an attitude of calculated risk taking and learning from failure, all while ensuring the high level of cross-functional collaboration that is currently seen is maintained.
2. R&D should be maintained even after the initial product development and the investment should be strengthened, especially on long-term exploration research and protection of R&D funds from short-term financial pressures, to maintain the continuous innovation of new products and platform optimization.
3. The company should strengthen its partnerships by building deeper strategic relationships with global technology suppliers, local financial institutions, and regulatory agencies to increase the transfer of knowledge, lessen the transaction costs, and increase compliance efficiency.
4. Rather than focusing on only one dimension, Fintech companies in Nigeria and other emerging markets should embrace a balanced approach to innovation by leveraging their internal strengths while carefully cultivating external partnerships.

REFERENCES

Adegbite, O., & Rahman, M. (2023). Strategic partnerships and SME competitiveness in emerging economies. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 30*(4), 612–629.

Agyeman, F., & Boateng, E. (2024). Research and development investment and innovation challenges among SMEs in developing economies. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development, 16*(2), 145–159.

Ali, M., Peters, L., & Khan, S. (2024). Trust, relational commitment and long-term strategic partnership performance. *Industrial Marketing Management, 118*, 54–68.

Anwar, M., & Sun, S. (2024). Research and development investment, innovation, and firm performance: Evidence from Chinese manufacturing firms. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 9*(1), 100506.

Babatunde, S. A. (2021). Strategic partnerships and innovation in Nigeria's fintech ecosystem. *Journal of African Business and Economic Research, 16*(2), 102–118.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of*

Management, 17(1), 99–120.

Belussi, F., & Orsi, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Innovation, alliances, and networks in high-tech environments*. Routledge.

Berényi, L. (2022). Measuring product development performance: A multidimensional performance management perspective. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 71*(8), 3229–3248.

Blais, C. (2023). Innovation in SMEs in times of crisis: The ability to reconcile formality, agility and speed. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management, 20*(5), Article 2342002.

Chen, Y., & Lee, H. (2022). Strategic alignment and partnership performance among SMEs in Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 39*(4), 1121–1145.

Cheng, C. C. J., & Wu, C. W. (2021). Strategic management of research and development investment and innovation performance. *R&D Management, 51*(4), 428–443.

Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). *Open innovation: The new imperative for creating and profiting from technology*. Harvard Business School Press.

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*(1), 128–152.

Diaz-Chao, Á., Sainz-González, J., & Torrent-Sellens, J. (2021). Research and development investment and firm productivity: Evidence from European firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 172*, 121050.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal, 21*(10–11), 1105–1121.

Ekezie, C. C. (2023). Fintech innovation and digital financial inclusion in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business and Economic Development, 8*(1), 41–56.

El Hanchi, D., & Kerzazi, L. (2020). Understanding innovation capability: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 24*(5), 1565–1586.

Fernández-Guerras, V., López-Fernández, M. C., & Díaz-García, C. (2023). Innovation capability and product innovation performance: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Innovation Management*.

Fernández-Serrano, J., Romero, I., & Alegre, J. (2023). Research and development investment, absorptive capacity and innovation performance. *Research Policy, 52*(5), 104760.

García-Sánchez, I. M., & Aibar-Guzmán, B. (2021). R&D investment and corporate innovation: A systematic review. *Journal of Business Research, 124*, 239–252.

Grant, R. M. (1991). The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: Implications for strategy formulation. *California Management Review, 33*(3), 114–135.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(6), 1360–1380.

Gulati, R. (1998). Alliances and networks. *Strategic Management Journal, 19*(4), 293–317.

Hameed, W. U., Counsell, S., & Ozturk, Y. (2021). Knowledge sharing and innovation performance in strategic partnerships. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 25*(8), 1893–1915.

Hindi, N. M., & Frenkel, A. (2022). External collaboration strategies and innovation performance in high-technology firms. *Technovation, 118*, 102555.

Hsu, L. C., & Wang, C. H. (2017). Clarifying the effect of intellectual capital on performance: The mediating role of dynamic capability. *British Journal of Management, 23*(2), 179–205.

Idrees, I. A. (2023). Organizational learning capability and new product development performance: A systematic review. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 26*(6), 1785–1807.

Iheanachor, N. (2021). Innovation capability and product development performance in technology firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development, 7*(5), 29–42.

International Journal of Innovation Studies. (2024). Innovation capability: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Innovation Studies, 8*(1), 1–20.

Jain, A. (2023). *Innovation strategy: A complete guide to sustainable business growth*. StrategyLearn Publishing.

Joistpark. (2023). *Innovation strategy: Why organizations need a structured innovation approach*. https://joistpark.com

Kang, K. N., & Park, H. (2022). R&D investment and technological competitiveness: Evidence from manufacturing firms. *Technovation, 114*, 102451.

Knudsen, M. P., Lien, L. B., & Timmermans, B. (2023). Organizing for successful product development: Agile practices, governance and performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 40*(4), 547–567.

Lawson, B., & Samson, D. (2001). Developing innovation capability in organisations: A dynamic capabilities approach. *International Journal of Innovation Management, 5*(3), 377–400.

Lazzarotti, V., & Manzini, R. (2006). Innovation capability, R&D performance and product innovation performance. *Proceedings of the International CINet Conference*.

Li, Y., & Huang, J. (2021). Research and development collaboration, strategic partnerships and innovation performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 171*, 120983.

Lunden, I. (2020, October 15). *Stripe acquires Nigerian payments startup Paystack for over $200M*. TechCrunch. https://techcrunch.com/2020/10/15/stripe-acquires-nigerian-payments-startup-paystack-for-more-than-200m/

Mahmood, Z., & Rufín, R. (2023). Digital strategic partnerships and innovation performance in European manufacturing firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 191*, 122493.

Marquez, A., & Silva, P. (2022). Strategic alliances as risk mitigation mechanisms during economic crises. *Journal of Business Research, 146*, 612–623.

Masso, J., & Tiwari, A. K. (2022). R&D, innovation and productivity in catching-up economies. *Journal of Productivity Analysis, 58*(2), 175–194.

Mensah, K., & Osei, B. (2024). Research and development investment, innovation and firm performance in Africa. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies, 15*(1), 74–91.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Okonkwo, E., & Nwosu, C. (2021). Public-private partnerships and innovation in developing economies. *Public Organization Review, 21*(4), 789–807.

Okoro, P. O. (2021). Strategic alliances and product innovation among technology firms in emerging economies. *International Journal of Business Strategy, 21*(4), 87–101.

Oladipo, T. A. (2022). Innovation strategy and firm performance in Nigeria's digital economy. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies, 8*(2), 174–191.

Omoregbe, E. O. (2023). Innovation strategy and product competitiveness in technology-driven firms. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 12*(1), Article 48.

Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal, 14*(3), 179–191.

Phongthiya, P. (2024). Contextual factors influencing new product development performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 41*(2), 221–240.

Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*, 295–336.

Powell, W. W., Koput, K. W., & Smith-Doerr, L. (1996). Interorganizational collaboration and the locus of innovation: Networks of learning in biotechnology. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(1), 116–145.

Rao, P., & Dutta, S. (2023). Absorptive capacity, R&D investment and organizational innovation. *Technovation, 124*, 102725.

Saunila, M., & Ukko, J. (2012). A conceptual framework for the measurement of innovation capability and its effects. *Baltic Journal of Management, 7*(4), 355–375.

Sroka, W., & Cygler, J. (2021). Strategic partnerships and inter-organizational cooperation: Contemporary perspectives. *Sustainability, 13*(24), 13945.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of sustainable enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319–1350.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509–533.

Tian, M., Deng, P., Zhang, Y., & Salmador, M. P. (2021). Innovation capability and new product development performance in high-technology firms. *European Management Journal, 39*(6), 760–771.

Veleva, V., & Bodkin, G. (2021). Corporate sustainability through strategic partnerships. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 30*(6), 2876–2889.

Viridian. (2024). *Paystack: Building Africa's payment infrastructure*. Viridian Capital Reports.

World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024). *Global Innovation Index 2024*. WIPO. https://www.wipo.int/global_innovation_index/en/

Yang, C. H., & Sheu, C. (2016). Dynamic capabilities, technological innovation capabilities and new product development performance. *International Journal of Technology Management, 70*(2–3), 83–104.

Yu, Y., Chen, Y., & Xu, X. (2021). The effect of innovation capability on business performance: Evidence from Korean IT and business service firms. *Sustainability, 13*(24), 13833.

Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H. J., & Davidsson, P. (2006). Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A review, model and research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(4), 917–955.

Zeng, J., Cao, X., et al. (2022). Network structure and product innovation performance: An fsQCA approach. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 180*, 121692.

Zhang, Y., Li, X., & Wei, Z. (2023). Heterogeneous collaboration networks and innovation performance: The role of network centrality and structural holes. *Research Policy, 52*(4), 104701.