

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

---

# Towards a Transdisciplinary Epistemology of the Mode 4: Decolonizing Knowledge Production in African Missiology

---

[Pitshou Moleka](#) \*

Posted Date: 26 November 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202411.1724.v2

Keywords: Mode 4 Knowledge Production; Transdisciplinary Paradigm; Decuple Helix; African Missiology; Mission; African Theology; Church; Religion; Spirituality; Decolonial Epistemology; Collaborative Co-creation; Knowledge Integration; Systemic Transformation



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*

# Towards a Transdisciplinary Epistemology of the Mode 4: Decolonizing Knowledge Production in African Missiology

Pitshou Moleka

Managing Research African Network /Kinshasa, DR Congo; pmoleka@resanet.org  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0668-0919>

**Abstract:** This pioneering article offers a sweeping, paradigm-shifting exploration of the revolutionary emergence of "Mode 4" knowledge production—a fundamental reconceptualization of the epistemological, organizational, and methodological foundations of research and innovation within the field of African missiology. Drawing on cutting-edge theoretical frameworks from post-normal science, sustainability science, the science of integration, decolonial studies, and postcolonial theory, this work argues that Mode 4 represents a transformative leap towards a more collaborative, transdisciplinary, and adaptive approach to knowledge creation—one that holds the potential to catalyze a profound and lasting transformation in the way African missionaries conceive of, organize, and mobilize research to address the complex, interconnected challenges facing their communities. At the heart of this paradigm shift lies the groundbreaking "decuple helix" framework, which expands the scope of stakeholder engagement and knowledge co-creation to incorporate a comprehensive range of actors, from academia and industry to marginalized communities, the natural environment, and international organizations. By situating this revolutionary approach within the context of African missiology, the article delves deeply into the multifaceted roles and invaluable contributions of this diverse array of stakeholders, demonstrating how their active integration can unlock the transformative power of collaborative, values-oriented research and innovation for decolonizing and reimagining missionary praxis.

**Keywords:** mode 4 knowledge production; transdisciplinary paradigm; decuple helix; African missiology; mission; African theology, church, religion, spirituality, decolonial epistemology; collaborative co-creation; knowledge integration; systemic transformation; postcolonial theory

## 1. Introduction

In an era defined by the growing complexity and interconnectedness of global challenges, the limitations of traditional, linear and siloed models of knowledge production have become starkly apparent (Moleka, 2024a). Disciplines have become increasingly fragmented, with researchers operating in disciplinary silos that fail to adequately reflect the multifaceted nature of contemporary world problems (Maringe & Chiramba, 2023; Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1993; Pohl & Hirsch Hadorn, 2007). Moreover, the technocratic, value-neutral approach that has often characterized academic research has been widely criticized for its inability to account for the social, political, and ethical dimensions of knowledge production (Kates et al., 2001; Wittmayer & Schöpke, 2014). Recognizing these profound limitations, a growing body of pioneering scholarship has begun to explore the possibility of a transformative paradigm shift in the way knowledge is produced and applied (Gibbons, 1999; Nowotny et al., 2001; Carayannis & Campbell, 2012; Trencher et al., 2014). This scholarship has drawn inspiration from a diverse array of intellectual traditions, including post-normal science, sustainability science, the science of integration, decolonial studies, and postcolonial theory—all of which have laid crucial groundwork for the emergence of the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm.

## 2. Foundations of Mode 4 Knowledge Production

The Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm elaborated by the Congolese scholar Pitshou Moleka, can be traced to several influential strands of scholarship that have evolved over the past few decades, drawing from both Western and non-Western intellectual traditions. These foundational concepts include post-normal science, sustainability science, the science of integration, and the pioneering decouple helix framework, as well as vital contributions from decolonial studies and postcolonial theory. Importantly, this theoretical foundation is further enriched by the vital contributions of prominent African scholars, whose work has significantly shaped the epistemological, ontological, and methodological foundations of Mode 4 within the context of African missiology.

### *2.1. Post-Normal Science and the Embrace of Complexity*

The notion of "post-normal science," pioneered by Funtowicz and Ravetz (1993), challenges the assumption of value-free, detached scientific inquiry. In an era of high stakes and deep uncertainties, they argue, traditional models of science predicated on linear, reductionist approaches are woefully inadequate. Post-normal science calls for the incorporation of a broader range of stakeholders and the embrace of pluralistic, participatory methods that can grapple with the inherent complexity of real-world problems (Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1993; Hadorn et al., 2008; Moleka, 2024g; Moleka, 2024h; Moleka, 2024i; Moleka, 2024j). This emphasis on complexity, uncertainty, and the need for inclusive, participatory research methods directly aligns with the work of prominent African philosophers such as Kwasi Wiredu and Kwame Gyekye. Wiredu (1998) has powerfully argued for the need to interrogate and deconstruct the Eurocentric assumptions that have long dominated academic discourse, emphasizing the importance of drawing on African philosophical traditions that often emphasize the interconnectedness of the spiritual, social, and natural realms. Similarly, Gyekye (1995) has underscored the importance of centering African epistemologies and ontologies as a foundation for reimagining and decolonizing missionary engagement. By foregrounding these vital African voices, the Mode 4 paradigm shift within African missiology directly responds to the call for epistemic justice and the dismantling of colonial power structures.

### *2.2. Sustainability Science and Transdisciplinary Integration*

The emergence of "sustainability science" has also been instrumental in shaping the conceptual foundations of Mode 4 knowledge production. Sustainability science is characterized by a focus on complex, socio-ecological systems and a commitment to generating knowledge that can support the transition to more sustainable futures (Kates et al., 2001; Popa, Guillermin & Dedeurwaerdere, 2015). At the heart of sustainability science lies a transdisciplinary ethos, which aligns closely with the collaborative, integrative approach of Mode 4 (Lang et al., 2012; Caniglia et al., 2021). The transdisciplinary approach championed by sustainability science emphasizes the co-creation of knowledge between academic researchers and societal actors, such as policymakers, community groups, and industry representatives. This collaborative, problem-oriented approach transcends disciplinary boundaries, forging new pathways for the integration of different epistemologies, research methods, and ways of knowing (Lang et al., 2012; Caniglia et al., 2021). By positioning sustainability as a complex, socio-ecological challenge that requires the active engagement of a diverse array of stakeholders, sustainability science has laid the groundwork for the emergence of the Mode 4 paradigm within African missiology. Moreover, the transdisciplinary ethos of sustainability science resonates strongly with the decolonial perspectives of scholars such as Achille Mbembe (2016), who has emphasized the imperative for African scholars to celebrate the pluriversity of African knowledge systems and actively confront the colonial legacies that have shaped the field. By integrating these decolonial voices, the Mode 4 paradigm shift within African missiology becomes a powerful tool for dismantling the colonial hierarchies and power imbalances that have long defined the missionary enterprise.

### *2.3. The Science of Integration and Adaptive Approaches*

The nascent field of the "science of integration" has made vital contributions to the theoretical underpinnings of Mode 4 knowledge production. Scholars in this domain have sought to develop a comprehensive understanding of the processes and mechanisms by which diverse forms of knowledge can be effectively integrated to address complex problems (Hirsch Hadorn et al., 2006; Norström et al., 2020). The science of integration underscores the importance of adaptive, iterative, and reflexive research approaches that can navigate the inherent uncertainties and tensions involved in cross-disciplinary collaboration (Pohl, 2011; Luederitz et al., 2016). The recognition that complex, "wicked" problems require flexible, design-oriented research processes (Tinson, 2017) aligns closely with the work of African scholar Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013), who has emphasized the critical importance of centering the perspectives of indigenous communities, civic organizations, and social movements in the co-creation of knowledge and the reimagining of African development trajectories. By integrating these decolonial insights, the Mode 4 paradigm shift within African missiology becomes a powerful tool for navigating complexity, bridging diverse epistemologies, and empowering marginalized voices to shape the research agenda and catalyze transformative change.

#### *2.4. Decolonial and Postcolonial Perspectives: Towards a Pluriversal Epistemology*

Alongside the foundational concepts of post-normal science, sustainability science, and the science of integration, the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm within African missiology is also deeply informed by the groundbreaking work of decolonial and postcolonial scholars. These thinkers have powerfully challenged the Eurocentric biases and colonial legacies that have long shaped the missionary enterprise, calling for a radical reimagining of the epistemological, ontological, and methodological foundations of knowledge production. Scholars such as Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013), Achille Mbembe (2016), and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) have emphasized the imperative to center African and Indigenous knowledge systems, recognizing their vital role in confronting the complex challenges facing the continent. This decolonial approach aligns seamlessly with the collaborative, transdisciplinary ethos of the Mode 4 paradigm, which seeks to dismantle the hierarchical structures and power dynamics that have historically defined missionary research and practice. Moreover, postcolonial theorists like Homi K. Bhabha (1994) and Frantz Fanon (1963) have highlighted the importance of resisting the homogenizing and assimilationist tendencies of Western missionary work, emphasizing the need to celebrate the pluriversality of African cultures, identities, and ways of being. By integrating these decolonial and postcolonial perspectives, the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm within African missiology becomes a powerful tool for reimagining the missionary enterprise through the lens of epistemic justice, cultural pluralism, and the empowerment of marginalized voices.

#### *2.5. The Decuple Helix: Towards a More Inclusive and Holistic Knowledge Co-Creation*

The quadruple helix model developed by Pitshou Moleka, which emerged as an evolution of the earlier triple helix framework, recognized the need to expand the scope of knowledge production beyond the traditional triad of academia, industry, and government (Moleka, 2024m ; Carayannis & Campbell, 2012; Romero-Lankao et al., 2018). Building on this foundation, the decuple helix framework further broadens the range of actors involved in the research and innovation ecosystem, incorporating media and cultural institutions, the natural environment, social and values-based movements, marginalized or underrepresented communities, philanthropy and funding organizations, and religious and spiritual organizations. This inclusive, holistic approach to knowledge co-creation is a critical cornerstone of the Mode 4 paradigm within African missiology, as it enables the bridging of disciplinary divides, the empowerment of marginalized voices, and the co-evolution of problem definitions and solution pathways. By placing the decuple helix model at the center of the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm, this article highlights the transformative potential of this comprehensive framework for stakeholder engagement and collaborative knowledge co-creation within the field of African missiology. Moreover, the decuple helix framework aligns closely with the work of African feminist theologians such as Mercy Amba Oduyoye (2001), who has emphasized the centrality of African women's spirituality, community engagement, and



resistance to patriarchal structures within the missionary context. By actively integrating these vital perspectives, the Mode 4 paradigm shift within African missiology unlocks the transformative power of African women's leadership, epistemologies, and praxis in reimagining and decolonizing missionary work.

### **3. Mode 4 Knowledge Production: A Fundamental Rethinking**

#### *3.1. The epistemological shift*

The epistemological shift at the heart of Mode 4 knowledge production represents a radical reconceptualization of the role of the missionary researcher and the nature of missiological knowledge itself. By rejecting the notion of the researcher as a detached, "objective" observer and embracing a more collaborative, participatory, and pluralistic approach, Mode 4 challenges the rigid hierarchies and power dynamics that have historically characterized knowledge production within African missiology. Mode 4 recognizes the value of diverse forms of expertise, including marginalized communities, Indigenous knowledge holders, and decolonial thinkers, and actively engages these stakeholders in the co-creation of missiological knowledge. This inclusive, dialogical approach enables the bridging of disciplinary divides, the empowerment of previously excluded voices, and the co-evolution of problem definitions and solution pathways (Hadorn et al., 2008; Polk, 2015; Caniglia et al., 2021). Moreover, Mode 4 rejects the notion of a singular, objective "truth" in favor of a recognition of the plurality of valid perspectives and the contextual, situated nature of knowledge. This epistemological stance aligns with the principles of transdisciplinarity, which emphasizes the integration of different ways of knowing and the co-evolution of research questions and methodologies (Hirsch Hadorn et al., 2006; Popa, Guillermin & Dedeurwaerdere, 2015; Norström et al., 2020). By embracing a more collaborative, participatory, and pluralistic approach to knowledge creation, Mode 4 aims to better reflect the inherent complexity and interconnectedness of the challenges facing African societies, enabling missionaries to address wicked problems through meaningful, context-specific solutions. This epistemological foundation directly responds to the call of African decolonial scholars like Achille Mbembe (2016) for a "politics of difference" that celebrates the pluriversity of African knowledge systems.

#### *3.2. Ontological Shift and the Decolonial Imperative*

The paradigm shift embodied by Mode 4 knowledge production also demands a profound ontological reconceptualization within the field of African missiology. By centering the pluriversity of knowledge systems and the epistemic justice imperative, Mode 4 calls for missionaries to relinquish their claims to detached expertise and universal truths, instead embracing a posture of humility, reciprocity, and deep engagement with local, Indigenous, and decolonial ways of being and knowing. This ontological shift involves the reframing of the missionary's role from that of a detached observer or authoritative expert to that of a collaborative facilitator, co-learner, and decolonial interlocutor. Mode 4 invites a reconsideration of the ethical and normative foundations of the missionary calling, emphasizing the alignment of missionary praxis with broader societal values of equity, inclusion, and environmental regeneration (Hernández-Medina, 2010; Choquez-Millan et al., 2024). By centering the pluriversity of knowledge systems and challenging the Eurocentric and often universalist assumptions that have historically defined the missionary vocation, the Mode 4 paradigm shift within African missiology represents a profound decolonial imperative. This ontological transformation is essential for dismantling the colonial legacies that have long shaped the field and paving the way for a more inclusive, emancipatory, and holistically integrated future for the missionary enterprise. Prominent African philosophers like Kwasi Wiredu (1998) and Kwame Gyekye (1995) have laid crucial groundwork for this decolonial shift by emphasizing the importance of centering African epistemologies and ontologies.

#### *3.3. Methodological Transformation in Mode 4*

Alongside the epistemological and ontological shifts, Mode 4 knowledge production also demands a radical reconceptualization of research methodologies within the field of African missiology. Whereas traditional approaches have often relied on linear, reductionist, and extractive methods, the Mode 4 paradigm calls for the embrace of iterative, adaptive, and design-oriented research processes that can navigate complexity and generate actionable, context-specific solutions. The complexity and interconnectedness of the challenges facing African societies today defy simplistic, linear problem-solving approaches. Addressing wicked problems within the missionary enterprise requires flexible, design-oriented research methodologies that can accommodate evolving problem definitions, integrate diverse forms of knowledge, and co-create solutions through an iterative, collaborative process (Rittel & Webber, 1973; Pohl, 2011; Luederitz et al., 2016). At the heart of the methodological transformation within Mode 4 is the emphasis on iterative, adaptive research approaches. This involves the deployment of flexible, design-oriented methodologies that enable the co-evolution of problem definitions, research questions, and solution pathways in response to emerging insights and changing contexts (Norström et al., 2020). Rather than a linear, predetermined sequence of steps, Mode 4 research processes are characterized by iterative cycles of problem framing, data collection, analysis, and solution prototyping—all within a collaborative, transdisciplinary framework. By embracing flexibility, iteration, and collaborative problem-solving, these methodologies enable the active engagement of diverse stakeholders, the integration of multiple forms of knowledge, and the co-creation of context-specific, actionable solutions within the realm of African missiology (Popa, Guillermin & Dedeurwaerdere, 2015; Wittmayer & Schöpke, 2014; Caniglia et al., 2021). This aligns closely with the decolonial perspectives of scholars like Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013), who has emphasized the critical importance of centering the voices of indigenous communities, civic organizations, and social movements in the co-creation of knowledge.

### *3.4. Ethical and Normative Dimensions of Mode 4*

The paradigm shift embodied by Mode 4 knowledge production also carries profound implications for the ethics and normative foundations of African missiology. By centering issues of equity, inclusion, and environmental regeneration, Mode 4 challenges the historically paternalistic and often extractive tendencies of missionary praxis. The emphasis on collaborative, values-oriented research and innovation within the Mode 4 framework calls for missionaries to critically examine the ethical assumptions underlying their work and to reorient their efforts towards more holistic, emancipatory, and sustainable outcomes (Hernández-Medina, 2010; Choquez-Millan et al., 2024). This involves a reconsideration of the missionary's role, moving away from a position of detached authority and universalist truths towards one of humble, reciprocal engagement with local communities and their own systems of knowledge and belief. Moreover, the Mode 4 paradigm shift demands that missionaries actively work to dismantle the colonial legacies and power imbalances that have long shaped the field of missiology. By centering the pluriversality of knowledge systems and embracing decolonial epistemologies, Mode 4 represents a profound challenge to the Eurocentric, assimilationist tendencies that have historically characterized missionary praxis (Escobar, 2008; Boaventura de Sousa Santos, 2014). Ultimately, the ethical and normative dimensions of Mode 4 knowledge production within African missiology call for a radical reorientation of the missionary vocation—one that prioritizes values of reciprocity, epistemic justice, environmental stewardship, and the holistic wellbeing of the communities they serve. This transformative shift in the ethical foundations of missionary work is essential for aligning the field with the broader societal values of equity, inclusion, and sustainable development.

### *3.5. Implications for Missionary Praxis*

The implementation of the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm within African missiology has far-reaching implications for the actual practice and deployment of missionary activities. By embracing a more collaborative, transdisciplinary, and values-oriented approach, Mode 4 fundamentally reshapes the way missionaries engage with local communities, frame problems, design interventions, and evaluate the impacts of their work. Rather than relying on top-down,

expert-driven models of missionary outreach, Mode 4 calls for missionaries to adopt a posture of deep listening, reciprocal learning, and co-creative problem-solving. This involves the active integration of diverse stakeholders, including marginalized communities, Indigenous knowledge holders, and decolonial thinkers, in the co-definition of missionary priorities and the co-design of contextually relevant solutions. Moreover, the iterative, adaptive, and design-oriented methodologies championed by Mode 4 enable missionaries to respond dynamically to evolving needs and emerging insights, fostering a more nimble, flexible, and holistically integrated approach to missionary praxis. This shift away from rigid, linear models towards flexible, collaborative frameworks empowers local communities to assert greater agency and ownership over the missionary process, ultimately leading to more sustainable and impactful outcomes.

The implications of Mode 4 for missionary praxis also extend to the way in which missionary activities are funded, evaluated, and disseminated. By aligning with the decuple helix model and its emphasis on inclusive, values-oriented collaboration, missionaries can leverage a broader array of funding sources and develop more holistic, participatory, and transformative frameworks for evaluating missionary impact. Ultimately, the implementation of Mode 4 knowledge production within African missiology represents a profound transformation in the way the missionary enterprise is conceived, organized, and deployed. By embracing collaborative co-creation, decolonial epistemologies, and flexible, adaptive methodologies, missionaries can become powerful catalysts for systemic change, addressing the complex, interconnected challenges facing African societies through meaningful, contextually grounded solutions.

#### **4. Decolonizing African Missiology: Centering Indigenous Epistemologies**

The Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm within African missiology must be situated within the broader context of decolonial thought and the ongoing struggle to center African and Indigenous epistemologies. Scholars such as Kwasi Wiredu (1998) and Kwame Gyekye (1995) have powerfully argued for the need to interrogate and deconstruct the Eurocentric assumptions that have long dominated missionary praxis in Africa. They emphasize the importance of drawing on African philosophical traditions, which often emphasize the interconnectedness of the spiritual, social, and natural realms, as a foundation for re-imagining and decolonizing missionary engagement (Wiredu, 1998; Gyekye, 1995). In addition, Achille Mbembe (2016) emphasizes how important it is for African academics to actively challenge the colonial legacies that have influenced the creation of knowledge by adopting a "politics of difference" that values the diversity of African knowledge systems. This decolonial approach aligns closely with the epistemological foundations of Mode 4, which rejects the notion of a singular, universal truth in favor of a recognition of the contextual, situated nature of knowledge (Mbembe, 2016). By integrating African philosophical traditions and decolonial perspectives, Mode 4 knowledge production within African missiology can become a powerful tool for dismantling the colonial hierarchies and power imbalances that have long defined the missionary enterprise.

#### **5. Amplifying the Voices of African Women in Missionary Praxis**

At the core of the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm is Pitshou Moleka's decuple helix framework, which has enormous promise for empowering underrepresented African voices—especially women's voices—in the missionary research ecosystem. It is crucial to prioritize the perspectives of indigenous communities, civic organizations, social movements, and women in the co-creation of knowledge and the reimagining of African development trajectories, according to scholars like Everisto Benyera (2019) and Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013). Mercy Amba Oduyoye (2001) and Isabel Phiri (2009) have powerfully articulated the need to center the contributions of African women, both as active participants in church growth and revitalization, as well as lay people who have accompanied and shaped the work of white missionaries. Oduyoye's groundbreaking work on African women's theology has emphasized the centrality of African women's spirituality, community engagement, and resistance to patriarchal structures within the missionary context (Oduyoye, 2001). Similarly, Phiri's research has documented the vital role played by African women

in the redynamization and revitalization of churches from colonial times to the present, often in the face of oppressive gender norms and colonial legacies (Phiri, 2009). The doctoral thesis of Congolese theologian Kilongo Fatuma, "Les héroïnes sans couronne: Leadership des femmes dans les Églises de Pentecôte en Afrique Centrale" (2015), further highlights how women are omnipresent in all activities of Pentecostal churches in the Eastern part of the Democratic Republic of Congo, yet are absent from decision-making structures, with only men ordained in pastoral ministry. By embracing the decuple helix framework, Mode 4 knowledge production creates space for the active integration of these African women's perspectives, epistemologies, and praxis within the missionary research ecosystem. This inclusive, collaborative approach not only challenges the patriarchal structures that have historically defined the field, but also unlocks the transformative potential of African women's leadership, spirituality, and community-based engagement in reimagining and decolonizing missionary work. The integration of African women's voices within Mode 4 research and innovation holds the promise of more holistic, contextually relevant, and emancipatory approaches to missionary praxis that are firmly rooted in the diverse realities and aspirations of African communities.

## 6. The Bible as the Supreme Source of Truth in African Missiology

In addition to the vital contributions of African philosophers, theologians, and decolonial thinkers, the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm within African missiology must also grapple with the central role of the Bible as the supreme source of truth and authority within the field. Traditional African missiology has often been characterized by a strict adherence to biblical literalism and the notion of the Bible as the inerrant, divinely-inspired word of God (Nderitu, 2023; Togarasei, 2020). This epistemological foundation has shaped the ontology, methodology, and praxis of missionary work, privileging Eurocentric interpretations of Scripture and resisting engagement with alternative forms of knowledge and ways of knowing. The Mode 4 paradigm shift, with its emphasis on collaborative co-creation, pluralistic epistemologies, and adaptive research approaches, presents a profound challenge to this long-standing tradition. Scholars such as Lovemore Togarasei (2020) and Sarojini Nadar (2009) have underscored the need to carefully navigate this tension, recognizing the central role of the Bible in African Christian thought and practice, while simultaneously creating space for the integration of diverse epistemologies, methodologies, and societal perspectives. This process of negotiation and synthesis is essential for the successful implementation of the Mode 4 paradigm within the context of African missiology, ensuring that the transformative potential of this approach is grounded in the spiritual and theological foundations that have long guided the missionary enterprise.

## 7. Pedagogical Dimensions of Mode 4 in African Missiology Curricula

The implementation of the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm within African missiology also carries profound implications for the way the field is taught and transmitted within academic and theological training institutions. Scholars such as Lovemore Togarasei (2020) and Sarojini Nadar (2009) have emphasized the need to restructure missiology curricula to better reflect the transdisciplinary, collaborative, and decolonial ethos. Togarasei's work on the decolonization of theological education in Africa has highlighted the importance of integrating diverse epistemologies, research methodologies, and case studies that showcase the co-creative, values-oriented nature of Mode 4 knowledge production (Togarasei, 2020). Aspiring missionaries must be exposed to iterative, design-oriented approaches to problem-solving, as well as the skills and dispositions required for deep engagement with local communities, Indigenous knowledge holders, and marginalized stakeholders. Moreover, the pedagogical framework must actively challenge Eurocentric assumptions, center African philosophical traditions, and empower students to become decolonial interlocutors and facilitators of transformative change. Nadar's work on feminist, contextual, and liberationist approaches to biblical interpretation and theological education further underscores the need to integrate the perspectives of African women and other marginalized groups within missiology curricula (Nadar, 2009). By embedding the Mode 4 paradigm within African missiology



curricula, educational institutions can play a crucial role in nurturing a new generation of missionaries who are equipped to navigate complexity, integrate diverse forms of knowledge, and co-create context-specific, emancipatory solutions in partnership with the communities they serve.

## 9. Limitations and Outlook

While the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm holds immense promise for the decolonization and revitalization of African missiology, it is important to acknowledge the significant challenges and limitations that may arise in its implementation. The dismantling of entrenched institutional structures, the bridging of diverse epistemologies, and the alignment of incentives and funding mechanisms to support collaborative, transdisciplinary research are all formidable hurdles that will require sustained commitment and systemic transformation. Moreover, the Mode 4 approach may face resistance from traditionalist or conservative factions within the missionary enterprise who are invested in maintaining the status quo. Navigating these tensions and fostering a shared vision for a more inclusive, emancipatory, and holistically integrated missionary praxis will be an ongoing struggle that requires patience, diplomacy, and a deep commitment to the principles of epistemic justice and decolonial empowerment. Despite these challenges, the potential of the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm to catalyze a profound and lasting transformation within African missiology remains immense. By embracing collaborative co-creation, centering decolonial epistemologies, and empowering marginalized voices, this revolutionary approach holds the promise of unlocking new pathways for addressing the complex, interconnected challenges facing African societies through meaningful, contextually grounded missionary solutions. As the field of African missiology continues to evolve, the implementation of the Mode 4 paradigm represents a clarion call for a new era of missionary praxis - one that is firmly rooted in values of equity, inclusion, and holistic wellbeing, and empowers communities to chart their own paths towards a more sustainable and emancipatory future.

## 8. Conclusion

The revolutionary emergence of the Mode 4 knowledge production paradigm holds immense transformative potential for the field of African missiology. By radically reconceptualizing the epistemological, organizational, and methodological foundations of the missionary research enterprise, Mode 4 opens new pathways for a more collaborative, transdisciplinary, and adaptive approach to addressing the complex, interconnected challenges facing African societies. At the heart of this paradigm shift lies the decuple helix framework, which expands the scope of stakeholder engagement and knowledge co-creation to incorporate a comprehensive range of actors, from academia and industry to marginalized communities, the natural environment, and international organizations. This inclusive, holistic model enables the bridging of disciplinary divides, the empowerment of previously excluded voices, and the co-evolution of problem definitions and solution pathways - all of which are essential for navigating the wicked problems that have long plagued the missionary enterprise. The profound implications of Mode 4 for African missiology span the epistemological, ontological, methodological, ethical, and praxiological dimensions of the field. By rejecting the notion of the missionary researcher as a detached, "objective" observer and embracing a more collaborative, participatory, and pluralistic approach to knowledge creation, Mode 4 challenges the rigid hierarchies and power dynamics that have historically defined missionary research and outreach. This epistemological shift, coupled with a profound ontological reconceptualization that centers the pluriversality of knowledge systems and the decolonial imperative, paves the way for a radical reorientation of the missionary vocation. Alongside these conceptual transformations, Mode 4 also demands a methodological shift towards iterative, adaptive, and design-oriented research processes that can navigate complexity, integrate diverse forms of knowledge, and co-create context-specific, actionable solutions. This flexible, collaborative approach to missionary praxis empowers local communities to assert greater agency and ownership over the missionary process, leading to more sustainable and impactful outcomes. Undergirding these paradigmatic shifts are the ethical and normative dimensions of Mode 4, which call for missionaries

to critically examine the assumptions underlying their work and to reorient their efforts towards values of reciprocity, epistemic justice, environmental stewardship, and the holistic wellbeing of the communities they serve. This transformation in the ethical foundations of missionary work is essential for aligning the field with broader societal values of equity, inclusion, and sustainable development.

Ultimately, the revolutionary potential of Mode 4 knowledge production within African missiology lies in its ability to catalyze a fundamental shift in the way the missionary vocation is conceived, organized, and deployed. By embracing collaborative co-creation, decolonial epistemologies, and flexible, adaptive methodologies, missionaries can become powerful agents of systemic change, addressing the complex, interconnected challenges facing African societies through meaningful, contextually grounded solutions. This paradigm shift represents a clarion call for a new era of missionary praxis - one that is firmly rooted in values of equity, inclusion, and holistic wellbeing, empowering communities to chart their own paths towards a more sustainable and emancipatory future.

## References

1. Achebe, C. (1958). *Things fall apart*. William Heinemann.
2. Adamo, D. T. (2015). Reading the Bible in the context of African indigenous culture and the global village. *Black Theology*, 13(2), 147-171.
3. Benyera, E. (2019). Decolonising the University in Africa. *African Identities*, 17(2), 147-163.
4. Berkes, F. (2012). *Sacred ecology* (3rd ed.). Routledge. Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
5. Boaventura de Sousa Santos. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. Routledge.
6. Caniglia, G., Luederitz, C., von Wirth, T., Fazey, I., Martín-López, B., Hondrila, K., ... & Lang, D. J. (2021). A pluralistic and integrated approach to action-oriented knowledge for sustainability. *Nature Sustainability*, 4(2), 93-100.
7. Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. (2012). Mode 3 knowledge production in quadruple helix innovation systems. In E. G. Carayannis & D. F. Campbell (Eds.), *Mode 3 Knowledge Production in Quadruple Helix Innovation Systems* (pp. 1-63). Springer.
8. Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. SAGE Publications.
9. Choquez-Millan, M., Hernández-Medina, E., Escobar, A., & Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2024). Decolonizing Missionary Praxis: Towards a Pluriversal Ethos of Reciprocity and Epistemic Justice. *International Review of Mission*, 113(2), 123-145.
10. Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
11. Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139-167.
12. Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (3rd ed.). NYU Press.
13. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
14. Dordrecht. Fuster Morell, M., & Senabre Hidalgo, E. (2022). Innovationology: A Holistic Approach to Innovation and Transition Research. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1350.
15. Escobar, A. (2008). *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Duke University Press.
16. Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press.
17. Fatuma, K. (2015). *Les héroïnes sans couronne: Leadership des femmes dans les Églises de Pentecôte en Afrique Centrale*. Globethics.
18. Funtowicz, S. O., & Ravetz, J. R. (1993). Science for the post-normal age. *Futures*, 25(7), 739-755.
19. Gadamer, H. G. (1989). *Truth and method* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
20. Garrard, E. (2004). Ocampo's "Tsotsi": Engaging with the urban poor through film. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 30(1), 195-208.
21. Gibbons, M. (1999). Science's new social contract with society. *Nature*, 402(6761), C81-C84.
22. Gyekye, K. (1995). *An Essay on African Philosophical Thought: The Akan Conceptual Scheme*. Temple University Press.
23. Hadorn, G. H., Hoffmann-Riem, H., Biber-Klemm, S., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., Pohl, C., ... & Zemp, E. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of transdisciplinary research* (Vol. 10). Springer.
24. Hernández-Medina, E. (2010). Social inclusion through participation: the case of the participatory budget in São Paulo. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(3), 512-532.
25. Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2010). *Mixed methods research: Merging theory with practice*. Guilford Press.

26. Hirsch Hadorn, G., Hoffmann-Riem, H., Biber-Klemm, S., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., Pohl, C., ... & Zemp, E. (2006). Handbook of transdisciplinary research (Vol. 10). Springer.
27. Hirsch Hadorn, G., Hoffmann-Riem, H., Biber-Klemm, S., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., Pohl, C., ... & Zemp, E. (Eds.). (2008). Handbook of transdisciplinary research (Vol. 10). Springer.
28. Holter, K. (2002). Old Testament research for Africa: A critical analysis and annotated bibliography of African Old Testament dissertations, 1967-2000. Peter Lang.
29. Kates, R. W., Clark, W. C., Corell, R., Hall, J. M., Jaeger, C. C., Lowe, I., ... & Svedin, U. (2001). Sustainability science. *Science*, 292(5517), 641-642.
30. Kilongo, F. (2015). Les héroïnes sans couronne: Leadership des femmes dans les Églises de Pentecôte en Afrique Centrale
31. Klein, J. T. (2010). A taxonomy of interdisciplinarity. In R. Frodeman, J. T. Klein, & C. Mitcham (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity* (pp. 15-30). Oxford University Press.
32. Lang, D. J., Wiek, A., Bergmann, M., Stauffacher, M., Martens, P., Moll, P., ... & Thomas, C. J. (2012). Transdisciplinary research in sustainability science: practice, principles, and challenges. *Sustainability science*, 7(1), 25-43.
33. Levin-Keitel, M., Mölter, H., Othengrafen, F., & Behrend, J. (2018). The resilience of places in the context of socio-ecological change—a conceptual framework and research agenda. *Planning Practice & Research*, 33(3), 280-301.
34. Luederitz, C., Abson, D. J., Audet, R., & Lang, D. J. (2016). Many pathways toward sustainability: not conflict but co-learning between transition narratives. *Sustainability Science*, 12(3), 393-407.
35. Maluleke, T. S. (2000). The Bible among African Christians: A missiological perspective. In T. Okure (Ed.), *Handbook of theological education in Africa* (pp. 87-112). Regnum Books International.
36. Mampani, R. (2022). *Performing African Christianity: Oral traditions, visual arts, and ritual in the Democratic Republic of Congo*. Baylor University Press.
37. Maringe, F., & Chiramba, O. (2023). Boundary knowledge in conversation: Imagining higher education through transdisciplinarity and decoloniality. *The Journal for transdisciplinary research in Southern Africa*, 19(1), 10.
38. Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the postcolony*. University of California Press.
39. Mbembe, A. (2016). Decolonizing the University: New Directions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 15(1), 29-45.
40. Mertens, D. M. (2010). Transformative mixed methods research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 469-474.
41. Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
42. Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
43. Morin, E. (2008). *On complexity*. Hampton Press.
44. Nadar, S. (2009). Contextual Bible Study as Transformative Praxis. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 135, 91-102.
45. Moleka, P. (2024a). Innovationology: A Comprehensive, Transdisciplinary Framework for Driving Transformative Innovation in the 21st Century. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202409.0700.v1>
46. Moleka, P. (2024b). Innovationology: A Transdisciplinary Science for Transformative Innovation and Sustainable Global Development. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202409.1064.v1>
47. Moleka, P. (2024c). Frugal Innovation for Inclusive and Sustainable Development in Africa. *Advanced Research in Economics and Business Strategy Journal*.5(1):107-117.
48. Moleka, P. (2024d). Accelerating the Innovation Lifecycle in Innovationology: Cutting-Edge Strategies for Reducing Time-to-Market. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202409.1658.v1>
49. Moleka, P. (2024e). *Holistic Education. Enhancing the Mind, Body and Soul. The Innovationology Series / TOME V*. GRIN : Verlag.
50. Moleka, P. (2024f). *Innovationology and the Geoconomics of the BRICS. Towards a Sustainable and Equitable Global Order. The Innovationology Series / TOME VII*. GRIN : Verlag.
51. Moleka, P. (2024g). Innovationology: A Goundbreaking Transdisciplinary Framework for Sustainable and Equitable Development in Africa. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Review*. 7(5):178-193.
52. Moleka, P. (2024h). Innovation Metrics for the 21st Century: An Innovationology-based Comprehensive, Multidimensional Framework. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Review*. 7(5):199-210.
53. Moleka, P. (2024i). Narratives of Sustainable Transformation: The Power of Speculative Fiction in Innovationology. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202410.0204.v1>
54. 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.

55. Moleka, P. (2024k). Ubuntu and Sustainable Cities in Africa. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Ubuntu, Inequality and Sustainable Development*.
56. Chapter DOI 10.1007/978-3-031-69573-5\_22
57. Moleka, P. (2024l). The Transformative Power of Innovationology. *Preprints*. 2024102225. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202410.2225.v1>
58. Moleka, P. (2024m). The Revolutionary Potential of Mode 4 Knowledge Production. *Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202410.2509.v1>
59. Moleka, P. (2024n). Redefining the Future of Innovation: The Transformative Potential of the Decuple Helix Framework. [DOI:10.20944/preprints202411.0216.v1](https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202411.0216.v1)
60. Moleka, P. (2024o). Integral Ecology of Innovation: Bridging Spirituality, Sustainability, and Systems Thinking. [DOI:10.20944/preprints202411.0442.v1](https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202411.0442.v1)
61. Moleka, P. (2024p). *Paradigm Shift in Knowledge Production: A Decolonial Manifesto for*
62. *Epistemic Justice and Emancipatory Transformation*. [DOI:10.20944/preprints202411.0785.v1](https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202411.0785.v1)
63. Nadar, S. (2009). Articulating feminist theologies in Africa: Perspectives and prospects. In S. Nadar, A. Phiri, & E. Conradie (Eds.), *Ragbag theologies: Essays in honour of Denise M. Ackermann, a feminist theologian of praxis* (pp. 61-72). SUN Press.
64. Nderitu, J. (2023). The role of the Bible in African missiology: A critical analysis. *International Bulletin of Mission Research*, 47(1), 23-35.
65. Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). Coloniality of Power in Postcolonial Africa: Myths of Decolonization. CODESRIA.
66. Nicolescu, B. (2002). *Manifesto of transdisciplinarity*. SUNY Press.
67. Norström, A. V., Cvitanovic, C., Löf, M. F., West, S., Wyborn, C., Balvanera, P., ... & Österblom, H. (2020). Principles for knowledge co-production in sustainability research. *Nature Sustainability*, 3(3), 182-190.
68. Nowotny, H., Scott, P., & Gibbons, M. (2001). Re-thinking science: Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty. Polity.
69. Oduyoye, M. A. (2001). *Introducing African Women's Theology*. Sheffield Academic Press.
70. Phiri, I. A. (2009). African Women in Mission: The Case of the Church of Central Africa Presbyterian, Synod of Livingstonia in Malawi. *Missionalia*, 37(2), 9-26.
71. Phiri, I. A., & Werner, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of theological education in Africa*. Regnum Books International.
72. Pohl, C. (2011). What is progress in transdisciplinary research?. *Futures*, 43(6), 618-626.
73. Pohl, C., & Hirsch Hadorn, G. (2007). Principles for designing transdisciplinary research. *Oekom*.
74. Polk, M. (2015). Transdisciplinary co-production: Designing and testing a transdisciplinary research framework for societal problem solving. *Futures*, 65, 110-122.
75. Popa, F., Guillermin, M., & Dedeurwaerdere, T. (2015). A pragmatist approach to transdisciplinarity in sustainability research: From complex systems theory to reflexive science. *Futures*, 65, 45-56.
76. Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2008). *The SAGE handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. Repko, A. F., & Szostak, R. (2017). *Interdisciplinary research: Process and theory* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
77. Rittel, H. W., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy sciences*, 4(2), 155-169.
78. Romero-Lankao, P., Steinhoff, K., Iñarra, B., Velasco, E., Tian, H., Chen, Y., & Tong, D. (2018). Expanding the collaborative frame: The role of the natural environment within the quadruple helix of smart city innovation. *Sustainability*, 10(7), 2305.
79. Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books. Wa Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
80. Tinson, N. (2017). *Dog Collars and Turtlenecks: Design Thinking in Leadership of the Local Church*.
81. Togarasei, L. (2020). *The Bible in African Christianity: Historical and ethnographic perspectives*. SUN Press.
82. Trencher, G., Yarime, M., McCormick, K. B., Doll, C. N., & Kraines, S. B. (2014). Beyond the third mission: Exploring the emerging university function of co-creation for sustainability. *Science and Public Policy*, 41(2), 151-179.
83. Ukpong, J. S. (2000). Developments in biblical interpretation in Africa: Historical and hermeneutical directions. In G. O. West & M. W. Dube (Eds.), *The Bible in Africa: Transactions, trajectories, and trends* (pp. 11-28). Brill.
84. Wiredu, K. (1998). Toward Decolonizing African Philosophy and Religion. *African Studies Quarterly*, 1(4), 17-46.
85. Wittmayer, J. M., & Schäpke, N. (2014). Action, research and participation: roles of researchers in sustainability transitions. *Sustainability science*, 9(4), 483-496.

**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.