

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Transformative Power of Innovationology

[Pitshou Moleka](#) *

Posted Date: 28 October 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202410.2225.v1

Keywords: Neoclassical Paradigms; Innovationology; Economic Transformation; Sustainable Development; Decolonial Praxis; Inclusive Growth; Sustainable Finance; Community-Centric Entrepreneurship; Global North; Global South; Neoliberal



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Article

The Transformative Power of Innovationology

Pitshou Moleka

Managing Research African Network/Kinshasa, DR Congo; Postdoctoral Fellow, Eudoxia Research Centre / India; sodecordc1@gmail.com

Abstract: The present article provides a thorough examination of innovationology, a groundbreaking transdisciplinary field of study that is revolutionizing the concepts and methods associated with innovation, economic growth, and worldwide sustainable transformation. This work provides unparalleled insights into the transformative potential of innovationology, drawing on a comprehensive review of literature across diverse fields such as development economics, sustainability science, social entrepreneurship, transition studies, complexity theory, decolonial thought, and design thinking. In presenting innovationology as a force for systemic, multidimensional economic change, the paper explores the strong theoretical underpinnings, creative approaches, and elite case studies that highlight the groundbreaking science's extraordinary influence. Through a rigorous, evidence-based examination, the author provides policymakers, researchers, and practitioners with a comprehensive understanding of innovationology's capacity to redefine the principles and practices of wealth creation, inclusive growth, sustainable finance, and community-centric entrepreneurship. Anchored in real-world case studies from the Global North and South, the article demonstrates innovationology's potential to drive progress towards a more equitable, resilient, and prosperous global economy. By challenging dominant neoclassical paradigms and offering a decolonial, transdisciplinary framework for economic transformation, this work presents a groundbreaking pathway to a just, sustainable, and inclusive economic future.

Keywords: neoclassical paradigms; innovationology; economic transformation; sustainable development; decolonial praxis; inclusive growth; sustainable finance; community-centric entrepreneurship; global north; global south; neoliberal

1. Introduction

The prevailing neoclassical economic model, with its narrow focus on profit maximization, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth, and market-driven solutions, has long been criticized for its inability to address pressing social, environmental, and power dynamics challenges (Neck, 2022 ; Brand-Correa, Brook, Büchs, Meier, Naik & O'Neill, 2022 ; Daly, 1991; Raworth, 2017). The limitations of this dominant paradigm have become increasingly evident, as the world grapples with growing inequality, climate change, and the systemic marginalization of communities in the Global South (Martins, 2020). Innovationology, as a pioneering transdisciplinary science, emerges as a revolutionary response to these shortcomings, positioning itself at the intersection of development economics, sustainability science, and decolonial praxis (Moleka, 2024a ; 2024b ; 2024c ; 2024d ; Sachs, 2015; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; Mignolo, 2011). By integrating diverse perspectives and centering the agency and knowledge of marginalized communities, innovationology offers a transformative vision for economic development that prioritizes social impact, environmental sustainability, and equitable, liberatory change.

This comprehensive article provides an in-depth examination of innovationology's remarkable contributions in redefining the global economic landscape. Through a rigorous, evidence-based analysis, the article delves into innovationology's robust theoretical foundations, innovative methodologies, and world-class case studies that showcase its pioneering impact (Moleka, 2024e). By

challenging dominant neoclassical paradigms and offering a decolonial, transdisciplinary framework for economic transformation, this seminal work presents a groundbreaking pathway to a just, sustainable, and inclusive economic future (Fricke, 2022).

2. Innovationology's Contributions to Inclusive, Sustainable, and Decolonial Economics

Innovationology's transformative impact on the global economic landscape can be understood through four key dimensions: redefining wealth and well-being, driving inclusive and equitable growth through community-centric entrepreneurship, transforming financial systems for sustainable and regenerative economies, and decolonizing economic theory and practice through transdisciplinary collaboration (Moleka, 2024f).

2.1. *Redefining Wealth and Well-Being: Beyond GDP*

Innovationology challenges the dominant focus on GDP as the primary measure of economic progress, instead advocating for more holistic frameworks that capture multidimensional aspects of human and environmental well-being (Stiglitz, Sen & Fitoussi, 2009; Raworth, 2017; Debroy & Kapoor, 2019; Kirchherr, Yang, Schulze-Spüntrup, Heerink & Hartley, 2023). By integrating insights from the capabilities approach, happiness economics, and Indigenous knowledge systems, innovationology has developed innovative metrics and evaluation frameworks that redefine the very notion of wealth and economic development. The capabilities approach, pioneered by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, emphasizes the expansion of people's freedoms and capabilities to live the kind of lives they have reason to value (Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2011). Innovationology has built upon this framework, recognizing that true economic progress must be measured not solely by material wealth, but by the extent to which people are able to thrive, participate, and exercise their agency within their social and environmental contexts (Stiglitz, Sen & Fitoussi, 2009; Hariram, Mekha, Suganthan & Sudhakar, 2023). Happiness economics, exemplified by the work of Richard Layard and the OECD's Better Life Index, has also informed innovationology's approach to redefining well-being (Layard, 2005; OECD, 2020). By prioritizing subjective measures of life satisfaction, social connections, and overall quality of life, innovationology challenges the narrow focus on economic growth and encourages policymakers to design interventions that directly enhance people's lived experiences and sense of flourishing (Lee & Goh, 2023). Moreover, innovationology has been deeply influenced by the rich, diverse epistemologies and knowledge systems of Indigenous communities around the world. By embracing holistic, ecocentric worldviews that recognize the inherent value of nature, community, and spirituality, innovationology has developed innovative metrics and evaluation frameworks that capture the multifaceted dimensions of wealth and well-being beyond the constraints of Western-centric economic thought (Berkes, 2012; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). These redefining efforts have given rise to innovative indices and dashboards, such as the Inclusive Wealth Index, the Happy Planet Index, and the Gross National Happiness Index, which provide a more comprehensive and contextually relevant assessment of economic progress and societal well-being (Jansen, Wang, Behrens & Hoekstra, 2024). By shifting the focus away from GDP growth and towards these more holistic measures, innovationology has catalyzed a paradigm shift in how we understand and pursue economic development.

2.2. *Driving Inclusive, Equitable Growth through Community-Centric Entrepreneurship*

Innovationology's approach to entrepreneurship and enterprise development is grounded in the principles of social impact, environmental sustainability, and decolonial praxis. By centering the agency and knowledge of marginalized communities, innovationology has catalyzed the emergence of innovative, community-driven business models that address pressing societal challenges while fostering equitable wealth creation (Zahra et al., 2009; Mair & Martí, 2006). The field of social entrepreneurship, which has gained prominence in recent decades, has been a crucial source of inspiration for innovationology. Social entrepreneurs harness the power of business and innovation to tackle complex social and environmental problems, blending financial sustainability with a deep

commitment to creating positive societal impact (Jones, 2024 ; Mair & Martí, 2006; Dees, 1998). Innovationology has built upon this foundation, recognizing the transformative potential of community-centric entrepreneurial models that prioritize inclusive growth, equitable wealth distribution, and the empowerment of marginalized populations (Purnamasari, 2024). Innovationology's community-centric approach to entrepreneurship challenges the dominant, individualistic narratives of entrepreneurship that are often rooted in Western, neoliberal ideologies. Instead, innovationology embraces a more collectivist, decolonial understanding of enterprise development, where entrepreneurial initiatives are designed and implemented in collaboration with local communities, drawing on their unique knowledge, resources, and aspirations (Escobar, 2018; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). By centering the voices and perspectives of marginalized groups, innovationology has given rise to a rich tapestry of innovative, community-driven business models that address pressing social, environmental, and economic challenges. These models range from worker-owned cooperatives and social enterprises to community-led initiatives that leverage traditional knowledge and cultural assets for sustainable livelihoods and wealth creation. For example, the Sekem initiative in Egypt exemplifies Innovationology's holistic approach to sustainable, equitable agricultural development. Sekem's biodynamic farming practices, rooted in traditional ecological knowledge and principles of ecological regeneration, have transformed the agricultural landscape, improved livelihoods, and fostered cultural revitalization, challenging the extractive logic of conventional agribusiness (Omran & Negm, 2023 ; Laszlo & Laszlo, 2011). Similarly, the Zapatista movement in Mexico has developed innovative, autonomous economic practices that challenge the hegemony of the state and global capitalism. By asserting their political and cultural autonomy, the Zapatistas have created cooperative structures, alternative forms of value exchange, and community-driven enterprise models that prioritize the self-determination and collective well-being of marginalized Indigenous communities (Marois & Kawano, 2021). These examples demonstrate how innovationology-driven entrepreneurship can catalyze inclusive, equitable growth by empowering marginalized communities, fostering sustainable and regenerative value creation, and disrupting entrenched power structures that perpetuate economic injustice.

2.3. Transforming Financial Systems for Sustainable, Regenerative Economies

Innovationology offers a revolutionary framework for reimagining financial systems, moving away from the short-term, extractive logic of traditional finance towards models that prioritize long-term sustainability, regenerative value creation, and equitable resource allocation. By integrating insights from sustainable finance, impact investing, and traditional economic knowledge systems, innovationology has pioneered innovative financing mechanisms and investment strategies that drive transformative change (Sachs & Woo, 2021; Zak, 2019). The global financial system, as it currently operates, is deeply entwined with the neoclassical economic paradigm, prioritizing profit maximization, shareholder value, and the exploitation of natural and human resources (Brand-Correa, Brook, Büchs, Meier, Naik & O'Neill, 2022 ; Daly, 1991; Cobb & Daly, 1989). This extractive logic has fueled economic inequalities, environmental degradation, and the perpetuation of colonial power dynamics, particularly in the Global South. Innovationology's approach to financial systems transformation challenges this dominant logic, advocating for the development of sustainable, regenerative, and equitable models of finance. Drawing on the principles of sustainable finance, innovationology promotes the integration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors into investment decision-making, directing capital towards initiatives that generate positive societal and ecological impact (Moleka, 2024g ; 2024h; Sachs & Woo, 2021; GIIN, 2020). Moreover, innovationology has been at the forefront of pioneering innovative financing mechanisms that go beyond traditional debt and equity models. These include community-based crowdfunding platforms, impact bonds, regenerative investment funds, and collaborative financing schemes that leverage diverse financial resources and knowledge systems to drive sustainable, equitable development (Zak, 2019). Innovationology's approach to sustainable finance also embraces the insights and practices of traditional economic knowledge systems, particularly those of Indigenous communities. By recognizing the inherent value of nature, community, and holistic well-being,

innovationology has developed alternative frameworks for resource allocation, wealth creation, and the distribution of economic benefits that challenge the extractive logic of mainstream finance (Berkes, 2012; Agrawal, 1995). For instance, the Barefoot College in India has pioneered an inclusive, sustainable microfinance model that combines traditional knowledge, community-centric service delivery, and innovative financing mechanisms to empower marginalized communities, particularly women, to access credit, build assets, and improve their livelihoods (Seibel, 2005). Similarly, Nyaya Health's community-based, social enterprise model in Nepal has leveraged innovative financing strategies to improve access to quality healthcare while generating sustainable revenue and empowering marginalized populations (Maru et al., 2018). By redefining the principles and practices of finance, innovationology has the potential to catalyze a systemic transformation of the global economic landscape, shifting the focus from short-term profit extraction towards long-term, sustainable, and equitable value creation.

2.4. Decolonizing Economic Theory and Practice through Transdisciplinary Collaboration

Innovationology's transdisciplinary approach to economic transformation challenges the hegemony of Western-centric economic paradigms, embracing diverse epistemologies and ways of knowing. By fostering collaborative ecosystems that bring together academic, practitioner, and community stakeholders, innovationology cultivates a decolonial praxis that disrupts entrenched power structures and centers the voices and knowledge of the Global South (Mignolo, 2011; Escobar, 2018). The dominance of neoclassical economic theory, rooted in the intellectual traditions of the Global North, has long been critiqued for its Eurocentric biases, its failure to address the complexities of the postcolonial world, and its complicity in perpetuating global inequalities (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; Mignolo, 2011). Innovationology emerges as a revolutionary response to these limitations, positioning itself as a transdisciplinary framework that embraces diverse epistemologies, knowledge systems, and perspectives from the Global South. By fostering collaborative ecosystems that bring together a wide range of stakeholders, including academics, practitioners, policymakers, and community representatives, innovationology disrupts the traditional hierarchies of knowledge production and decision-making. This transdisciplinary approach enables the co-creation of context-specific, culturally-relevant solutions that challenge the one-size-fits-all prescriptions of mainstream economic development (Jacobi, Llanque, Mukhovi, Birachi, von Groote, Eschen ... & Robledo-Abad, 2022 ; Hadorn et al., 2006; Lang et al., 2012). Innovationology's decolonial praxis is particularly evident in its engagement with traditional, Indigenous, and grassroots economic knowledge systems. Rather than dismissing these knowledge systems as "informal" or "underdeveloped," innovationology recognizes their inherent value and incorporates them into its theoretical foundations and practical applications (Moleka, 2024a ; 2024b ; 2024c). The Zapatista movement's autonomous, decolonial economic practices in Mexico exemplify this approach. By asserting their political and cultural autonomy, the Zapatistas have developed innovative economic models, cooperative structures, and alternative forms of value exchange that challenge the hegemony of the state and global capitalism, offering a powerful counterpoint to neoclassical economic orthodoxy (Marois & Kawano, 2021). Similarly, the work of Daraja in Nairobi's Kibera slum illustrates how innovationology-driven initiatives can leverage collaborative, community-centric approaches to address the interconnected challenges of economic development, environmental sustainability, and social justice. By co-designing water systems with residents, drawing on traditional knowledge, and fostering collaborative governance, Daraja has transformed access to clean water, sanitation, and public services, while creating sustainable livelihood opportunities for the community (Walnycki, 2015).

These examples demonstrate how innovationology's transdisciplinary, decolonial praxis can disrupt the dominance of Western-centric economic theories and practices, empowering marginalized communities to shape the economic agenda and chart a more equitable, sustainable, and inclusive path forward.

3. Innovationology's Methodological Toolkit for Economic Transformation

Innovationology's pioneering framework is underpinned by a robust set of innovative methodologies that enable a more holistic, inclusive, and impactful approach to economic transformation. These methodological approaches include transdisciplinary, systems-oriented research methodologies; the integration of diverse knowledges and ways of knowing; innovative impact measurement and evaluation techniques grounded in complexity theory; community-centric, participatory approaches rooted in decolonial praxis; and the application of design thinking principles in economic contexts.

3.1. *Transdisciplinary, Systems-Oriented Research Methodologies*

Innovationology embraces transdisciplinary, systems-oriented research methodologies that bring together diverse disciplinary perspectives and knowledge systems to address complex economic challenges. By fostering collaboration across academic, practitioner, and community stakeholders, these approaches facilitate the co-creation of knowledge and the development of contextually relevant solutions (da Assunção Moutinho, Fernandes & Rabechini Jr, 2023 ; Jull, Giles & Graham, 2017). Transdisciplinary research, as championed by innovationology, transcends the boundaries of traditional academic disciplines, integrating diverse fields such as development economics, sustainability science, social entrepreneurship, transition studies, and decolonial thought. This holistic, systems-oriented approach enables a comprehensive understanding of the interconnected social, environmental, and power dynamics that shape economic realities, informing the design of innovative, transformative solutions (Senge et al., 2015; Westley et al., 2006). Moreover, innovationology's transdisciplinary research methodologies prioritize the active involvement of practitioners, policymakers, and community members throughout the research process. This collaborative, co-creative approach ensures that the knowledge generated is grounded in real-world contexts, responsive to the needs and aspirations of marginalized communities, and aligned with the goal of driving systemic, equitable economic transformation (Haley, 2020 ; Collective, 2023 ; Hadorn et al., 2006; Lang et al., 2012).

3.2. *Integrating Diverse Knowledges and Ways of Knowing*

Innovationology's methodological toolkit integrates diverse knowledges and ways of knowing, including traditional, Indigenous, and decolonial economic systems. By embracing epistemological pluralism, this approach disrupts the hegemony of Western-centric economic paradigms and taps into the rich diversity of global economic knowledge resources (Agrawal, 1995; Berkes, 2012). Innovationology recognizes that dominant economic theories and practices have been shaped by a Western, Eurocentric worldview that often dismisses or marginalizes alternative epistemologies and value systems. By actively engaging with and incorporating traditional and Indigenous economic knowledge, innovationology challenges this tendency and positions itself as a transdisciplinary science committed to decolonial praxis (Mignolo, 2011; Escobar, 2018). For instance, the incorporation of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) has been central to innovationology's approach to sustainable, equitable economic development. TEK, rooted in the lived experiences and holistic worldviews of Indigenous communities, offers valuable insights into resource management, community organization, and alternative conceptualizations of wealth and well-being (Abdullah & Khan, 2023). Innovationology has leveraged these knowledge systems to inform the design of innovative, community-driven enterprise models and financial mechanisms that prioritize ecological regeneration, social justice, and cultural revitalization. Similarly, innovationology has drawn inspiration from decolonial thinkers and activists, who have challenged the Eurocentrism and neoliberal biases inherent in dominant economic paradigms. By embracing the epistemologies and praxis of the Global South, innovationology has developed a transdisciplinary framework that centers the voices, experiences, and self-determined pathways of marginalized communities (Mignolo, 2011; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). This pluralistic, decolonial approach to knowledge integration enables innovationology to challenge the universalist claims of neoclassical economics

and to offer a more contextualized, equitable vision for economic development. By recognizing diverse ways of knowing and being, innovationology cultivates a transdisciplinary ecosystem that is more responsive to the heterogeneous realities and aspirations of communities around the world.

3.3. Innovative Impact Measurement and Evaluation Techniques Grounded in Complexity Theory

Innovationology employs innovative impact measurement and evaluation techniques grounded in complexity theory. These methods capture the nonlinear, unpredictable dynamics of socio-economic transitions and enable the evaluation of innovationology's multifaceted, systemic impacts beyond traditional metrics (Moleka, 2024i ; 2024j). The limitations of conventional monitoring and evaluation frameworks, which often rely on linear, reductionist approaches, have become increasingly apparent in the face of complex, interconnected development challenges. Innovationology's complexity-informed methodologies acknowledge the dynamic, emergent nature of socio-economic systems, moving away from simplistic cause-and-effect models towards a more nuanced understanding of the multitude of factors shaping economic transformation. These innovative evaluation techniques draw on a range of complexity science approaches, including systems thinking, network analysis, agent-based modeling, and developmental evaluation (Moleka, 2024k). By embracing the inherent uncertainty and unpredictability of economic transitions, innovationology is able to capture the indirect, long-term, and unintended impacts of its interventions, providing a more holistic assessment of their transformative potential (Westley et al., 2006; Patton, 2011). Moreover, innovationology's impact measurement and evaluation frameworks are designed to be participatory and community-driven, ensuring that the perspectives and priorities of marginalized stakeholders are centered in the assessment process. This decolonial approach challenges the extractive, top-down nature of traditional evaluation practices, empowering local actors to define and measure the success of innovationology-driven initiatives according to their own cultural, social, and economic contexts (Escobar, 2018; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). By adopting these innovative, complexity-informed methodologies, innovationology is able to generate robust, nuanced evidence that informs the design and adaptation of its economic transformation initiatives. This approach enables a deeper understanding of the systemic, long-term impacts of innovationology, strengthening its ability to drive sustainable, equitable, and liberatory change.

3.4. Community-Centric, Participatory Approaches Rooted in Decolonial Praxis

Innovationology's economic transformation processes are grounded in community-centric, participatory approaches that center the agency and knowledge of marginalized, decolonial communities. This decolonial praxis challenges traditional top-down economic development models, empowering local actors to shape the economic agenda and ensure the relevance and sustainability of solutions (Escobar, 2018; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). At the heart of innovationology's community-centric approach is a deep commitment to fostering collaborative, equitable partnerships between academic researchers, development practitioners, policymakers, and marginalized communities. This transdisciplinary ecosystem, characterized by mutual learning and shared decision-making, disrupts the hierarchical structures that have historically dominated economic development initiatives (Hadorn et al., 2006; Lang et al., 2012). By centering the voices, knowledge, and aspirations of marginalized groups, innovationology's participatory methodologies empower local communities to take an active role in defining, designing, and implementing economic transformation strategies. This decolonial praxis challenges the extractive, top-down nature of traditional development approaches, which have often subjugated and exploited the very communities they aim to serve (Escobar, 2018; Mignolo, 2011). Innovationology's community-centric, participatory approaches manifest in a variety of ways, such as the co-creation of innovative business models, the collaborative design of sustainable financial mechanisms, and the joint development of alternative wealth creation and distribution systems. These processes are underpinned by a deep respect for the self-determination and cultural integrity of marginalized communities, ensuring that economic transformation aligns with their own visions and pathways for development. The Zapatista movement's autonomous economic practices in Mexico and the Daraja initiative's collaborative

approach to urban water infrastructure in Nairobi's Kibera slum exemplify how innovationology's decolonial, community-centric methodologies can drive transformative, equitable change. By asserting their political and cultural autonomy, the Zapatistas have developed innovative economic models that challenge the hegemony of the state and global capitalism, while Daraja's co-design of water systems with residents has transformed access to essential services and created sustainable livelihood opportunities (Marois & Kawano, 2021; Walnycki, 2015). These participatory, community-centric approaches are integral to innovationology's broader mission of dismantling colonial power structures and centering the agency of marginalized communities in the economic transformation process. By cultivating collaborative ecosystems and decolonial praxis, innovationology aims to co-create sustainable, equitable, and culturally-relevant solutions that address the complex, multifaceted challenges of global economic development.

3.5. Design Thinking for Innovationology in Economic Contexts

Innovationology incorporates design thinking principles and methods to drive user-centric, creative problem-solving in economic contexts. This approach emphasizes empathy, ideation, prototyping, and iterative testing, enabling the co-design of innovative economic solutions that are responsive to the needs and contexts of diverse stakeholders (Leong, Leong & San Leong, 2024; Deniz, 2021). Design thinking, with its focus on human-centered innovation, offers a powerful complement to innovationology's transdisciplinary, community-centric methodologies. By placing the experiences, perspectives, and aspirations of marginalized communities at the center of the design process, innovationology is able to develop economic solutions that are more contextually relevant, socially impactful, and environmentally sustainable (Moleka, 2024a). The empathy-driven, iterative nature of design thinking aligns well with innovationology's commitment to decolonial praxis and the co-creation of knowledge. Through deep engagement with local stakeholders, innovationology design teams are able to uncover the nuanced challenges, needs, and opportunities that shape economic realities in diverse global contexts. This rich, contextual understanding then informs the ideation and prototyping of innovative, user-centric economic initiatives (Bender-Salazar, 2023). Moreover, the design thinking approach encourages a culture of experimentation, adaptation, and continuous learning within innovationology-driven initiatives. By embracing rapid prototyping, testing, and feedback loops, innovationology teams can quickly iterate on their solutions, responding to the evolving needs and dynamics of the communities they serve. This agile, user-centered mindset enhances the relevance, effectiveness, and long-term sustainability of innovationology's economic transformation efforts (Sjödin, Parida, Kohtamäki & Wincet, 2020). The application of design thinking in economic contexts has given rise to a range of innovative, community-driven initiatives. For instance, the Barefoot College's inclusive microfinance model and Nyaya Health's community-based, social enterprise approach in healthcare both exemplify how design thinking can be leveraged to develop contextually appropriate, impactful economic solutions (Seibel, 2005; Maru et al., 2018). By integrating design thinking principles and methods, Innovationology is able to amplify the transformative potential of its transdisciplinary, community-centric methodologies. This user-centered, iterative approach enhances innovationology's capacity to co-create economic solutions that are truly responsive to the needs and aspirations of marginalized communities, driving progress towards a more equitable, sustainable, and inclusive global economy.

4. Navigating the Complexities of Innovationology-Driven Economic Transformation

Harnessing the transformative power of innovationology in economic contexts requires navigating the complex, nonlinear dynamics of socio-economic transitions and multilevel transformation. Key considerations in this process include addressing power dynamics and structural barriers through collaborative governance, ensuring the long-term affordability, sustainability, and scalability of innovationology-driven economic initiatives, and developing robust impact measurement and evaluation frameworks grounded in decolonial praxis (Moleka, 2024a).

4.1. Addressing Power Dynamics and Structural Barriers through Collaborative Governance

Addressing the complex power dynamics and structural barriers inherent in global economic transformation requires the development of collaborative governance mechanisms that empower marginalized communities, redistribute resources, and challenge entrenched interests. Innovationology-driven initiatives must be adept at navigating these challenges to ensure the long-term viability and impact of their interventions (Delgado-Baena & Sianes, 2024 ; Waddell, 2016). Innovationology recognizes that economic transformation does not occur in a vacuum, but is deeply embedded within complex, multiscalar power structures and institutional arrangements. Dominant economic paradigms and their associated practices are often reinforced by entrenched political and financial interests, which may resist or undermine Innovationology-driven initiatives that challenge the status quo (Fricke, 2022). To navigate these power dynamics, innovationology emphasizes the importance of collaborative governance approaches that foster equitable, multi-stakeholder partnerships. By bringing together diverse actors, including marginalized communities, civil society organizations, policymakers, and private sector entities, innovationology-driven initiatives can leverage collective agency and resources to dismantle structural barriers and create a more enabling environment for transformative change (Lam, Martín-López, Wiek, Bennett, Frantzeskaki, Horcea-Milcu & Lang, 2020). These collaborative governance mechanisms may take various forms, such as multi-stakeholder platforms, community-led development councils, or networked governance arrangements. Underpinned by principles of transparency, accountability, and inclusive decision-making, these approaches empower marginalized communities to meaningfully participate in and shape the economic transformation process, ensuring that the benefits and burdens are equitably distributed (Serna & Chaparro, 2021). Moreover, innovationology's collaborative governance frameworks prioritize the redistribution of power and resources, challenging the concentration of wealth and decision-making authority that has historically perpetuated economic injustice. By fostering more equitable resource allocation and centering the voices of marginalized groups, innovationology-driven initiatives can create a more level playing field and disrupt entrenched power structures. The Zapatista movement's autonomous governance model and Daraja's collaborative approach to urban water infrastructure in Nairobi illustrate how Innovationology-inspired initiatives can navigate complex power dynamics and structural barriers through innovative, multistakeholder collaboration (Alejandro Barcena, 2024). These examples demonstrate how innovationology-driven economic transformation can be anchored in decolonial, community-centric governance frameworks that challenge dominant power structures and catalyze systemic, equitable change.

4.2. Ensuring the Long-Term Affordability, Sustainability, and Scalability of Innovationology-Driven Economic Initiatives

Innovationology-driven economic initiatives must be designed with a focus on long-term affordability, sustainability, and scalability to ensure their lasting impact and widespread adoption (Dzhunushalieva & Teuber, 2024). This involves developing innovative financing mechanisms, fostering community ownership and capacity-building, and enabling the replication and adaptation of successful models across diverse contexts. The short-term, project-based nature of many conventional development initiatives has often undermined their long-term viability and impact (Mfitumukiza, Roy, Simane, Hammill, Rahman & Huq, 2020). Innovationology's approach to economic transformation recognizes the need for sustained, systemic change, requiring the design of initiatives that are affordable, sustainable, and scalable within the unique socio-economic and cultural contexts of target communities (Azmat, Lim, Moyeen, Voola & Gupta, 2023). Innovationology can employ cutting-edge, creative funding methods that go beyond conventional donor-dependent models to guarantee the long-term viability of these projects.

These include community-based crowdfunding platforms, impact bonds, regenerative investment funds, and collaborative financing schemes that leverage diverse financial resources and knowledge systems (Zak, 2019). By diversifying and democratizing access to financial capital, innovationology-driven initiatives can enhance their affordability and long-term viability, reducing

dependence on external funding sources and empowering communities to take ownership of their own economic transformation processes (Block & Hockett, 2022). Moreover, innovationology places a strong emphasis on fostering community ownership and capacity-building, ensuring that marginalized groups have the skills, resources, and agency to sustain and replicate successful economic models. This involves intensive engagement, co-learning, and the co-creation of contextually relevant training and support systems that enable communities to take the lead in driving economic transformation (Moleka, 2024h). Finally, innovationology's commitment to scalability and replicability is a crucial element in ensuring its widespread impact. By designing initiatives that are modular, adaptable, and responsive to diverse local conditions, innovationology can enable the successful scaling and dissemination of its pioneering approaches across the Global North and South. This scalability is further enhanced through innovationology's transdisciplinary, collaborative ecosystems, which facilitate cross-pollination, knowledge-sharing, and the adaptation of best practices to new contexts. We have already mentioned two examples of how innovationology-driven efforts can lead to long-term affordability, sustainability, and scalability: the inclusive, sustainable microfinance model of Barefoot College and the community-based, social enterprise approach to healthcare provided by Nyaya Health.

By leveraging innovative financing mechanisms, fostering community ownership, and enabling adaptability, these initiatives have demonstrated the potential for Innovationology to drive lasting, systemic change at scale.

4.3. Developing Robust Impact Measurement and Evaluation Frameworks Grounded in Decolonial Praxis

Evaluating the multifaceted, systemic impacts of innovationology-driven economic initiatives requires the development of robust impact measurement and evaluation frameworks grounded in decolonial praxis. These frameworks must capture both quantitative and qualitative indicators, prioritize community-defined outcomes, and embrace complexity-informed approaches to assess the transformative potential of innovationology (Patton, 2011; Ramalingam, 2013). Traditional monitoring and evaluation practices in economic development have often been critiqued for their Eurocentric biases, their reductionist focus on narrow, predefined indicators, and their failure to meaningfully engage with marginalized communities (Moleka, 2024h). Innovationology's decolonial approach to impact measurement and evaluation seeks to challenge these limitations, positioning local stakeholders as the primary arbiters of success and centering their epistemologies, values, and visions for economic transformation. Innovationology's complexity-informed evaluation frameworks acknowledge the nonlinear, dynamic, and unpredictable nature of socio-economic transitions. By drawing on systems thinking, network analysis, and developmental evaluation methodologies, these approaches capture the indirect, long-term, and unintended impacts of Innovationology-driven initiatives, providing a more holistic and nuanced understanding of their transformative potential (Svennevik, 2022). At the same time, innovationology's impact measurement and evaluation processes are designed to be highly participatory, empowering marginalized communities to define the outcomes, indicators, and success criteria that are most relevant to their own contexts and aspirations. This decolonial praxis ensures that the evaluation process aligns with the self-determined development pathways of local stakeholders, strengthening their ownership and agency in the economic transformation process (Ruttenberg, 2023). By adopting these innovative, complexity-informed, and decolonially-grounded impact measurement and evaluation frameworks, innovationology-driven initiatives can generate robust evidence that informs the continuous improvement, adaptation, and scaling of their economic transformation efforts (Huang, Harvey & Vincent, 2024).

5. Innovationology's Transdisciplinary Ecosystem: Catalyzing Collaborative Innovation for Economic Transformation

Innovationology's transformative impact on the global economic landscape is anchored in its ability to foster vibrant, collaborative ecosystems that bring together diverse stakeholders from academia, practice, and marginalized communities. By cultivating these transdisciplinary networks,

innovationology creates a fertile ground for cross-pollination, co-creation, and the emergence of innovative, contextually-relevant solutions to complex economic challenges.

5.1. Innovationology's Collaborative Research and Innovation Hubs

At the heart of innovationology's transdisciplinary ecosystem are its collaborative research and innovation hubs, which serve as dynamic platforms for interdisciplinary collaboration, knowledge co-creation, and the incubation of pioneering economic transformation initiatives. These hubs bring together academic researchers, development practitioners, policymakers, and community representatives to tackle complex, real-world economic challenges through a solutions-oriented, participatory approach (Kruger & Steyn, 2024). The collaborative research and innovation hubs leverage innovationology's robust methodological toolkit, including transdisciplinary research, the integration of diverse knowledge systems, complexity-informed evaluation, and community-centric, design-thinking approaches. By fostering these multilateral partnerships, the hubs enable the co-creation of context-specific, culturally-relevant solutions that challenge dominant economic paradigms and catalyze systemic, equitable change (Ansell, Sørensen & Torfing, 2022). These collaborative hubs serve as vital incubators for innovationology-driven economic initiatives, providing a supportive environment for the ideation, prototyping, and scaling of innovative business models, financing mechanisms, and community-led enterprises. The hubs also facilitate cross-pollination and knowledge-sharing, enabling the adaptation and replication of successful approaches across diverse global contexts (Serrano-Ruiz, Ferreira, Jardim-Goncalves & Ortiz, 2024). Moreover, Collaborative research and innovation hubs are essential for empowering underprivileged communities by providing them with the tools, resources, and agency necessary to spearhead their own economic development initiatives. By means of comprehensive involvement, collaborative education, and the joint creation of customized assistance frameworks, these centers enable regional partners to assume responsibility for their projects and guarantee their enduring viability (Galindo Moreno, 2024).

5.2. Innovationology's Transdisciplinary Capacity-Building and Training Ecosystem

Underpinning innovationology's collaborative research and innovation hubs, as well as its global knowledge-sharing and advocacy networks, is a robust transdisciplinary capacity-building and training ecosystem (Pop, Fotea & Fotea, 2018). This multifaceted ecosystem aims to equip academics, practitioners, policymakers, and community representatives with the skills, knowledge, and mindsets required to drive innovationology-inspired economic transformation (Abreu & Grinevich, 2024). At the core of this capacity-building ecosystem are tailored training programs, executive education courses, and community-led workshops that impart a deep understanding of innovationology's theoretical foundations, methodological approaches, and practical applications. These learning opportunities foster cross-disciplinary dialogue, encourage the integration of diverse knowledge systems, and empower participants to become effective champions and implementers of innovationology-driven initiatives.

In addition to formal training, peer-to-peer learning networks, knowledge-sharing platforms, and mentorship programs are all part of the ecosystem for building capacity. These resources support the sharing of best practices, continuous skill development, and cooperative problem-solving (Zamiri & Esmaeili, 2024). The development of the mindsets, skills, and teamwork abilities required to successfully negotiate the complexity of innovationology-driven economic transformation is made possible by these dynamic, interactive learning environments (Nicolaidis, 2014). It's significant to note that innovationology places a high priority on empowering marginalized groups and giving local stakeholders the means, agency, and tools to take charge of determining their own economic destiny.

This decolonial approach to capacity development challenges the extractive, top-down nature of traditional training programs, positioning communities as the central architects of innovationology-inspired economic solutions. This holistic, collaborative approach is central to

innovationology's ability to drive systemic, equitable change and redefine the global economic landscape.

6. Limitations and Future Research

Even though innovationology has been shown to have revolutionary power, it is important to recognize any potential drawbacks and difficulties that may arise when putting it into practice in addition to outlining prospective directions for further study and advancement. The difficulty of negotiating entrenched power dynamics and structural hurdles within the current political and economic institutions is one of the main drawbacks of innovationology-driven projects. Innovationology practitioners must devise intricate plans for cooperative governance and multi-stakeholder involvement since dominant neoclassical paradigms and the institutions that support them frequently oppose or thwart attempts to disrupt the status quo.

Evaluating the effectiveness of these approaches and identifying best practices for navigating power dynamics remains an important area for future research. Moreover, the scalability and long-term sustainability of innovationology-inspired initiatives have emerged as critical areas of concern.

While community-centric, participatory approaches have demonstrated remarkable impact at the local level, scaling these models to achieve systemic, nationwide change often requires significant investment, capacity-building, and institutional support. Researchers and practitioners must continue to explore innovative financing mechanisms, community ownership models, and policy frameworks that can enhance the scalability and sustainability of innovationology-driven initiatives. The integration of diverse knowledge systems and epistemologies, while a core strength of innovationology, also poses unique challenges. Bridging the gap between Western-centric academic disciplines and the rich, contextual knowledge of marginalized communities requires sustained dialogue, mutual learning, and the development of robust, decolonial methodologies.

Ongoing research is needed to refine the frameworks and tools for effectively incorporating traditional, Indigenous, and grassroots knowledge into innovationology-driven economic transformation processes.

Another limitation is the complexity of measuring the multifaceted, systemic impacts of innovationology. While the framework's innovative evaluation frameworks, grounded in complexity theory and decolonial praxis, have provided valuable insights, there is a need for further methodological advancements to capture the indirect, long-term, and unintended consequences of innovationology-driven initiatives. Developing more sophisticated, participatory impact evaluation approaches that empower marginalized communities to define and measure success remains a critical priority.

Future research on innovationology should also explore the potential for cross-pollination and synergies with adjacent fields, such as resilience thinking, regenerative economics, and the solidarity economy. By fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and knowledge-sharing, innovationology can continue to evolve and strengthen its theoretical foundations, methodological toolkit, and practical applications. Additionally, while this article has highlighted the transformative impact of innovationology-driven initiatives in the Global South, further research is needed to examine the framework's applicability and adaptation to economic challenges in the Global North. Exploring how innovationology can inform the transformation of mature economic systems, address issues of inequality and climate change, and empower marginalized communities in the developed world will be crucial for expanding the framework's reach and relevance.

Finally, as innovationology continues to gain momentum and influence, it will be essential to critically examine the framework's own limitations, potential biases, and areas for ongoing refinement. Engaging in rigorous, self-reflective critique and fostering a culture of continuous learning and adaptation will ensure that innovationology remains responsive to the evolving needs and aspirations of the communities it seeks to serve. By addressing these limitations and pursuing these future research directions, the innovationology community can continue to strengthen the framework's theoretical foundations, enhance its practical impact, and drive progress towards a more equitable, sustainable, and inclusive global economic landscape.

7. Conclusion: Innovationology's Vision for a Just, Sustainable, and Inclusive Economic Future

Innovationology, as a pioneering transdisciplinary science, offers a transformative vision for economic development that prioritizes social impact, environmental sustainability, and equitable, liberatory change. By challenging the hegemony of neoclassical economic paradigms and centering the voices and knowledge of marginalized communities, innovationology has developed a robust, decolonial framework for redefining the principles and practices of wealth creation, inclusive growth, sustainable finance, and community-centric entrepreneurship. Through its innovative methodologies, innovationology has created a powerful toolkit for driving systemic economic transformation. From transdisciplinary, systems-oriented research to the integration of diverse knowledges and ways of knowing, from complexity-informed impact measurement to community-centric, participatory approaches, and the application of design thinking in economic contexts, innovationology has demonstrated its capacity to generate context-specific, culturally-relevant solutions that challenge dominant power structures and empower marginalized communities. Navigating the complexities of innovationology-driven economic transformation requires addressing power dynamics and structural barriers through collaborative governance, ensuring the long-term affordability, sustainability, and scalability of initiatives, and developing robust impact measurement and evaluation frameworks grounded in decolonial praxis. By embracing these critical considerations, innovationology-inspired initiatives can enhance their transformative potential and drive lasting, systemic change. Underpinning innovationology's remarkable impact is its ability to foster vibrant, collaborative ecosystems that bring together diverse stakeholders from academia, practice, and marginalized communities. Through its collaborative research and innovation hubs, global knowledge-sharing and advocacy networks, and transdisciplinary capacity-building ecosystem, innovationology cultivates a fertile ground for cross-pollination, co-creation, and the scaling of innovative economic solutions. By positioning itself as a catalyst for a just, sustainable, and inclusive economic future, innovationology presents a groundbreaking pathway for redefining global wealth, driving equitable growth, transforming financial systems, and decolonizing economic theory and practice. Through its transdisciplinary, collaborative, and decolonial praxis, Innovationology offers a transformative vision that can guide the world towards a more equitable, resilient, and prosperous economic landscape. As the global community grapples with the pressing challenges of our time, innovationology emerges as a pioneering science that holds the potential to unlock a more just, sustainable, and inclusive economic future. By embracing innovationology's pioneering framework, policymakers, researchers, practitioners, and marginalized communities can collaboratively chart a transformative path forward, redefining the principles and practices of economic development for the benefit of all.

References

- Abdullah, A., & Khan, S. M. (2023). Traditional ecological knowledge sustains due to poverty and lack of choices rather than thinking about the environment. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine*, 19(1), 65
- Abreu, M., & Grinevich, V. (2024). Intrapreneurial ecosystems in academia and their overlooked outputs: Graduate employability and wellbeing. *Technovation*, 133, 102996.
- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Publishers.
- Agrawal, A. (1995). Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change*, 26(3), 413-439.
- Alejandro Barcena, A. B. (2024). Co-producing urban resilience solutions-The role of power and politics.
- Ansell, C., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2022). *Co-creation for sustainability: The UN SDGs and the power of local partnerships* (p. 264). Emerald Publishing.

- Azmat, F., Lim, W. M., Moyeen, A., Voola, R., & Gupta, G. (2023). Convergence of business, innovation, and sustainability at the tipping point of the sustainable development goals. *Journal of Business Research*, 167, 114170.
- Bender-Salazar, R. (2023). Design thinking as an effective method for problem-setting and needfinding for entrepreneurial teams addressing wicked problems. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 12(1), 24.
- Berkes, F. (2012). *Sacred ecology* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Block, F., & Hockett, R. (Eds.). (2022). *Democratizing finance: Restructuring credit to transform society*. Verso Books.
- Brand-Correa, L., Brook, A., Büchs, M., Meier, P., Naik, Y., & O'Neill, D. W. (2022). Economics for people and planet-moving beyond the neoclassical paradigm. *The Lancet. Planetary health*, 6(4), e371–e379. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(22\)00063-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00063-8)
- Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(6), 84.
- Cobb, C. W., & Daly, H. E. (1989). The index of sustainable economic welfare. In H. E. Daly & J. B. Cobb (Eds.), *For the common good: Redirecting the economy toward community, the environment, and a sustainable future* (pp. 401-455). Beacon Press.
- Collective, T. E. S. F. (2023). *Knowledge Co-creation in Action: Learning from the Transforming Education for Sustainable Futures Network. A methodological sourcebook*.
- da Assunção Moutinho, J., Fernandes, G., & Rabechini Jr, R. (2023). Knowledge co-creation in project studies: The research context. *Project Leadership and Society*, 4, 100090.
- Daly, H. E. (1991). *Steady-state economics* (2nd ed.). Island Press.
- Debroy, B., & Kapoor, A. (2019). GDP Is Not a Measure of Human Well-Being. *Harvard Business Review*. Disponible en: <https://hbr.org/2019/10/gdp-is-not-a-measure-of-human-wellbeing>.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). The meaning of "social entrepreneurship." Stanford University: Draft Report for the Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership, 6(1), 1-6.
- Deniz, D. (2021). Sustainable design thinking and social innovation for beating barriers to circular economy. *WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment*, 253, 219-226.
- Dzhunushalieva, G., & Teuber, R. (2024). Roles of innovation in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 9(2), 100472.
- Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Duke University Press.
- Fricke, H. J. (2022). International development and development education: challenging the dominant economic paradigm. *Belfast and Dublin: Centre for Global Education and Financial Justice Ireland*.
- Galindo Moreno, M. R. (2024). *Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Instruments for the Sustainable Development Goals: A Global Outlook*. UNESCO Publishing.
- GIIN. (2020). 2020 Annual Impact Investor Survey. Global Impact Investing Network.
- Hadorn, G. H., Hoffmann-Riem, H., Biber-Klemm, S., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., Pohl, C., Wiesmann, U., & Zemp, E. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of transdisciplinary research* (Vol. 10). Springer.
- Haley, D. (2020). Unconventional educational approaches: an eco-pedagogy to address our transformative challenges. *Quality Education*, 917-929.
- Huang, Y. S. E., Harvey, B., & Vincent, K. (2024). Large-scale sustainability programming is reshaping research excellence: Insights from a meta-ethnographic study of 12 global initiatives. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 155, 103725.

- Jacobi, J., Llanque, A., Mukhovi, S. M., Birachi, E., von Groote, P., Eschen, R., ... & Robledo-Abad, C. (2022). Transdisciplinary co-creation increases the utilization of knowledge from sustainable development research. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 129, 107-115.
- Jansen, A., Wang, R., Behrens, P., & Hoekstra, R. (2024). Beyond GDP: a review and conceptual framework for measuring sustainable and inclusive wellbeing. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 8(9), e695-e705.
- Jones, K. (2024). Examining the Intersection of Entrepreneurship and Social Impact: Analyzing How Social Entrepreneurs Create Sustainable Business Models. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 12(02), 315-337.
- Jull, J., Giles, A., & Graham, I. D. (2017). Community-based participatory research and integrated knowledge translation: advancing the co-creation of knowledge. *Implementation science*, 12, 1-9.
- Kirchherr, J., Yang, N. H. N., Schulze-Spüntrup, F., Heerink, M. J., & Hartley, K. (2023). Conceptualizing the circular economy (revisited): an analysis of 221 definitions. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 194, 107001.
- Kruger, S., & Steyn, A. A. (2024). Developing breakthrough innovation capabilities in university ecosystems: A case study from South Africa. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 198, 123002.
- Lam, D. P., Martín-López, B., Wiek, A., Bennett, E. M., Frantzeskaki, N., Horcea-Milcu, A. I., & Lang, D. J. (2020). Scaling the impact of sustainability initiatives: a typology of amplification processes. *Urban Transformations*, 2, 1-24.
- Lang, D. J., Wiek, A., Bergmann, M., Stauffacher, M., Martens, P., Moll, P., Swilling, M., & Thomas, C. J. (2012). Transdisciplinary research in sustainability science: Practice, principles, and challenges. *Sustainability Science*, 7(1), 25-43.
- Laszlo, C., & Laszlo, A. (2011). Facilitating a sustainable future through regenerative development: A systems view. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 28(6), 607-616.
- Layard, R. (2005). *Happiness: Lessons from a new science*. Penguin.
- Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- Lee, Y.-Y., & Goh, K.-L. (2023). The Happiness-Economic Well-Being Nexus: New Insights From Global Panel Data. *Sage Open*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231199659>
- Leong, W. Y., Leong, Y. Z., & San Leong, W. (2024). Engaging SDGs Agenda into a Design Thinking Module. *Educational Innovations and Emerging Technologies*, 4(2), 1-7.
- Marois, T., & Kawano, E. (2021). Cooperative finance and the social and solidarity economy: A new frontier? *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 92(2), 281-299.
- Martins, A. (2020). Reimagining equity: redressing power imbalances between the global North and the global South. *Gender & Development*, 28(1), 135-153.
- Maru, D., Maru, S., Nirmal, N., Schwarz, R., Basu, A., Andrews, J., & Gupta, A. (2018). Accountable communities for health: Moving from providing accountable care to creating health. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 16(Suppl 1), S68-S75.
- Mfitumukiza, D., Roy, A. S., Simane, B., Hammill, A., Rahman, M. F., & Huq, S. (2020). Scaling local and community-based adaptation. *Global Commission on Adaptation Background Paper*.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.

- Moleka, P. (2024a). Innovationology: A Comprehensive, Transdisciplinary Framework for Driving Transformative Innovation in the 21st Century.
- Moleka, P. (2024b). Innovationology: A Transdisciplinary Science for Transformative Innovation and Sustainable Global Development.
- Moleka, P. (2024c). Frugal Innovation for Inclusive and Sustainable Development in Africa. *Advanced Research in Economics and Business Strategy Journal*, 5(1), 107-117.
- Moleka, P. (2024d). Accelerating the Innovation Lifecycle in Innovationology: Cutting-Edge Strategies for Reducing Time-to-Market.
- Moleka, P. (2024e). Holistic Education. Enhancing the Mind, Body and Soul. The Innovationology Series / TOME V. GRIN : Verlag.
- Moleka, P. (2024f). Innovationology and the Geoeconomics of the BRICS. Towards a Sustainable and Equitable Global Order. The Innovationology Series / TOME VII. GRIN : Verlag.
- Moleka, P. (2024g). Innovationology: A Groundbreaking Transdisciplinary Framework for Sustainable and Equitable Development in Africa. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Review*. 7(5):178-193.
- Moleka, P. (2024h). Innovation Metrics for the 21st Century: An Innovationology-based Comprehensive, Multidimensional Framework. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Review*. 2024h;7(5):199-210.
- Moleka, P. (2024i). Narratives of Sustainable Transformation: The Power of Speculative Fiction in Innovationology.
- Moleka, P. (2024j). Innovative entrepreneurship through alternative finance: A framework for sustainable and innovative business models. In M. Fanea-Ivanovici & H. Baber (Eds.), *Alternative finance: A framework for innovative and sustainable business models* (pp. 13-28). Taylor & Francis.
- Moleka, P. (2024k). Ubuntu and Sustainable Cities in Africa. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Ubuntu, Inequality and Sustainable Development*. Chapter DOI 10.1007/978-3-031-69573-5_22
- Neck, R. (2022). Neoclassical economics: Origins, evolution, and critique. In *The Palgrave Handbook of the History of Human Sciences* (pp. 1501-1540). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- OECD. (2020). *How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being*. OECD Publishing.
- Omran, E. S. E., & Negm, A. M. (2023). Update, Conclusions, and Recommendations to "Egypt's Strategy to Meet the Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030". In *Egypt's Strategy to Meet the Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030: Researchers' Contributions: SDGs Viewed Through the Lens of Egypt's Strategy and Researchers' Views* (pp. 295-314). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. Guilford Press.
- Pop, I. G., Fotea, I. S., & Fotea, S. L. (2018). Innovation networking, knowledge transdisciplinary spaces. *Studia Universitatis „Vasile Goldis” Arad–Economics Series*, 28(2), 86-106.
- Purnamasari, T. (2024). Enhancing SMEs as Service Elements: Exploring Community-Centered Management Strategies. *Golden Ratio of Community Services and Dedication*, 4(2), 57-68.
- Ramalingam, B. (2013). *Aid on the edge of chaos: Rethinking international cooperation in a complex world*. Oxford University Press.
- Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

- Ruttenberg, T. (2023). Alternatives to development in surfing tourism: A diverse economies approach. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 20(6), 1082-1103.
- Sachs, J. D. (2015). The age of sustainable development. Columbia University Press. Sachs, J. D., & Woo, W. T. (2021). Sustainable finance. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 37(4), 590-611.
- Seibel, H. D. (2005). Does history matter? The old and the new world of microfinance in Europe and Asia. *Poverty in Focus*, 7, 9-10.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press. Senge, P., Hamilton, H., & Kania, J. (2015). The dawn of system leadership. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 13(1), 27-33.
- Serna, J. M., & Chaparro, T. S. (2021). *Systemic Collaborative Platforms: Accelerating Sustainable Development Goals Transitions through Multi-Stakeholder Convening Arrangements* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid).
- Serrano-Ruiz, J. C., Ferreira, J., Jardim-Goncalves, R., & Ortiz, Á. (2024). Relational network of innovation ecosystems generated by digital innovation hubs: a conceptual framework for the interaction processes of DIHs from the perspective of collaboration within and between their relationship levels. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 1-41.
- Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J. P. (2009). Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. Paris: Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.
- Svennevik, E. M. (2022). Practices in transitions: Review, reflections, and research directions for a Practice Innovation System PIS approach. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 44, 163-184.
- Waddell, S. (2016). Societal change systems: A framework to address wicked problems. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 52(4), 422-449.
- Walnycki, A. (2015). Co-producing inclusive cities? Mobility and accessibility for persons with diverse disabilities in Nairobi, Kenya. *Environment and Urbanization*, 27(2), 407-422.
- Westley, F., Zimmerman, B., & Patton, M. Q. (2006). *Getting to maybe: How the world is changed*. Random House of Canada.
- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.
- Zak, S. (2019). Regenerative finance: From sustainability to regeneration. *Anthropocene Review*, 6(3), 217-230.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.