RADINKA JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

ISSN 2988-5825

https://www.rjupublisher.com/ojs/index.php/RJSLR

Fostering Research, Innovation, and Collaboration for Sustainable Societal and Economic Growth: A Quadruple Helix Approach to Knowledge Production and Development

Faith Nneka OKOSE[a], Amalaha Raphael OBINNA[b]

[a]*Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education Warri, Delta State, Nigeria*
[b]*Department of Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria*

*Corresponding author: amalaha.obinna@gmail.com

Abstract

The complexity of contemporary global socio-economic challenges necessitates robust research systems, dynamic innovation ecosystems, and resilient collaborative networks to generate sustainable solutions. This article examines research and innovation systems, collaborative frameworks, and their impact on modern knowledge economies. Grounded in the Quadruple Helix Theory, Open Innovation Theory, and Knowledge Spillover Theory, the study investigates the interactions among universities, industries, governments, and civil society for knowledge generation, technology transfer, and economic development. Utilizing a mixed-methods research design, quantitative data were gathered through surveys, while qualitative insights were collected from researchers, policymakers, industry leaders, and innovation practitioners. The findings indicate that strong multi-stakeholder collaboration significantly enhances research productivity, accelerates innovation diffusion, fosters entrepreneurship, and optimizes policy outcomes, contributing to societal well-being and economic competitiveness. However, institutional barriers, funding constraints, poor policy implementation, and weak stakeholder linkages remain critical impediments to impact. Strengthening research capacity, cultivating inclusive innovation ecosystems, and institutionalizing collaborative frameworks are essential to achieving sustainable development goals and driving lasting economic transformation. Based on these insights, actionable recommendations are provided for governments, higher education institutions, industries, and development agencies to improve research efficiency and foster innovation-led growth.

Keywords: Research collaboration, innovation ecosystems, knowledge transfer, societal impact, economic development.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to express their profound gratitude to all institutions, researchers, policymakers, industry leaders, and innovation practitioners who generously contributed their time, insights, and expertise to this study. Special appreciation is extended to the survey participants and local stakeholders whose active collaboration made the data collection possible. We also acknowledge the institutional resources and continuous support provided throughout the execution of this research.

For citation:
Okose, F. N., & Obinna, A. R. (2026). Fostering Research, Innovation, and Collaboration for Sustainable Societal and Economic Growth: A Quadruple Helix Approach to Knowledge Production and Development. *Radinka Journal of Science and Systematic Literature Review, 4*(2), 875-886.

Introduction

In today's knowledge-based economy, a nation's ability to drive sustainable social and economic growth relies heavily on its capacity to generate, assimilate, and apply innovation. Traditional linear innovation models have shifted toward more inclusive and interactive innovation ecosystems. One of the most relevant frameworks emerging in response to this dynamic is the Quadruple Helix approach. This model expands upon the Triple Helix framework—originally proposed by (Hasche et al., 2020; Roman et al., 2020), which focused on the relationships between academia, industry, and government—by integrating civil society as a crucial fourth actor in knowledge production and development. The first element of the Quadruple Helix ecosystem is the realm of academia and research institutions. Drawing on the work of (Klintman et al., 2022; Schütz et al., 2019), universities and research institutes serve as key pillars in creating both basic and applied knowledge, facilitating technology transfer, and supplying skilled human resources. Without the active role of the academic sector in pioneering fundamental knowledge, the entire innovation supply chain would lack the robust theoretical and methodological foundation needed to solve complex problems (Alkhazaleh et al., 2022; Feng & Jalali, 2024).

The industrial and business sector plays a crucial role as the second element driving the commercialization of knowledge. Industry acts as the mechanism that transforms laboratory research findings into products, processes, and services that offer economic value in the marketplace. Close collaboration between academia and industry not only accelerates the diffusion of technology but also ensures that research activities possess practical relevance and strong market competitiveness. Government and the public sector serve as the third pillar, acting as both enablers and regulators. As outlined by (Moreira et al., 2024; Petropoulos et al., 2026), the government plays a vital role in formulating public policy, providing incentive schemes and research funding, and establishing the legal frameworks and infrastructure necessary to facilitate cross-sector collaboration. Adaptive and forward-looking public policies serve as the primary foundation for creating an environment conducive to the development of regional and national innovation ecosystems. The most significant and fundamental distinguishing feature of the Quadruple Helix model is its fourth pillar: civil society, end-users of innovation, and community-based organizations. According to (Matthews et al., 2019; Bera et al., 2026), early public involvement—or "upstream engagement"—is crucial to ensuring that the trajectory of technological development and social innovation aligns with societal values, needs, and aspirations. The public is no longer viewed merely as passive consumers but as co-creators within the innovation process (Thapa et al., 2019; Lubberink et al., 2017).

The integration of these four pillars forms a knowledge production paradigm known as Mode 3. (Carbajo & Cabeza, 2022; Dreyer et al., 2017) emphasize that Mode 3 enables the creation of innovation systems that are more democratic, transdisciplinary, and networked (multilateral networks). Within this framework, knowledge does not flow in a single direction; instead, it circulates dynamically and multidirectionally among academia, industry, government, and society to address global socio-economic challenges. At the regional and practical policy levels, the

application of the Quadruple Helix model is a core component in formulating Smart Specialization Strategies (RIS3). Research by (Wesselow et al., 2025;(Regan, 2021) demonstrates that this approach is vital, particularly for remote or underdeveloped regions. In such areas, civil society groups and local actors often assume significant entrepreneurial roles when local industrial or academic pillars possess limited capacity. Beyond fostering economic growth, this approach aligns with the principles of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI). As emphasized by (Al-Mamary et al., 2026; Al-Hosan, 2026)and European Union development policies, RRI requires that the social, ethical, and environmental impacts of research be thoroughly evaluated from the outset. This aims to ensure that the resulting innovations not only drive financial growth but also support ecological sustainability and long-term social well-being. However, the practical implementation of the Quadruple Helix model faces various operational obstacles, such as power asymmetries among actors, bureaucratic hurdles, and challenges in mobilizing active civil society participation. To bridge the gap between theory and on-the-ground reality, experts such as (Urbano et al., 2026; Mai & Nguyen, 2023) recommend employing action research methodologies and developing participatory platforms like social labs and living labs. Against this backdrop, this study aims to analyze in depth how the Quadruple Helix approach can be optimized to foster sustainable research, innovation, and collaboration. By integrating the contributions of academia, industry, government, and civil society, it is hoped that a holistic strategy can be formulated to drive economic growth while simultaneously providing inclusive and sustainable solutions to future social challenges.

Methodology

A mixed-method explanatory sequential research design was used in this study. The use of structured questionnaires to stakeholders active in research, innovation and putting policies into practice was the quantitative phase. Interviews were conducted in a qualitative phase to better understand the experiences and perceptions of key stakeholder. The study participants were drawn from university researchers, research institutes personnel, innovation hubs managers, research and development professionals from industry, government policymakers, and entrepreneurs involved in innovation. Around 3,500 stakeholders were identified across the selected institutions. A 500 responses sample size was determined using Yamane's sampling formula at a 95% confidence level. The use of stratified random sampling ensured representation from each stakeholder group (Table 1). The institutional review board approved the ethical issues of the study, and we obtained consent from the participants before the data collection. Data were gathered using questionnaire and interview guide. The questionnaire was composed of the demographic items and Likert scale statements related to research capacity, innovation ecosystems, collaboration, social impact and economic development outcomes. Expert validation and pilot-testing of the instrument was done with 30 respondents outside the sample of the study. The analysis of reliability showed Cronbach's alpha equals 0.89 which is considered high. The descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis were applied to the quantitative data while the thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative data. The combination of quantitative and qualitative findings enabled the triangulation of research data and made the findings more credible, valid and comprehensive.

The demographic breakdown shows the study looked at the views of different actors in the research and innovation ecosystem. University researchers made up the largest category as they are the primary producers of knowledge and research products. Industry R&D personnel were included due to their involvement in commercialization of innovations and technologies. Policymakers spoke of the governance and regulatory frameworks. Also, managers of the innovation hubs and entrepreneurs spoke on business development and innovation implementation.

Table 1. Characteristic respondents (N=500)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Occupation	University Researchers	180	36.0
	Industry R&D Personnel	100	20.0
	Government Policy Officers	80	16.0
	Innovation Hub Managers	60	16.0
Age	25-34 Years	120	24.0
	35-44 Years	180	36.0
	45-54 Years	140	28.0
	55 Years and Above	60	12.0
Gender	Male	290	58.0
	Female	210	42.0
Educational Qualification	Bachelor's Degree	90	18.0
	Master's Degree	210	42.0
	Doctorate Degree	200	40.0

Sources: Author's Fieldwork, 2026

According to the educational profile, the respondents have sufficient skills to give rational views on research and innovation issues. The distribution of age reflects balanced representation of experienced professionals and younger innovation actors which makes the findings credible and comprehensive (Table 2).

Table 2. Return rates for distribution of questionnaire

Category	Distributed	Returned	Return rate (%)
University Researchers	180	170	94.4
Industry R&D Personnel	100	94	94.0
Government Policy Officers	80	75	93.8
Innovation Hub Managers	60	56	93.3
Entrepreneurs	80	75	93.8
Total	500	470	94.0

Sources: Author's Fieldwork, 2026

The questionnaire return rate of 94.0% indicates strong participation and findings can be relied on with confidence. The high response rates from all categories of stakeholders indicate that similar issues of research, innovation, and collaboration are on the minds of the respondents. Even sampling minimizes sampling bias and gives findings that reflect the experiences of various actors within the innovation ecosystem. A large return rate further bolsters the statistical significance in the following analyses.

Results

The results section of the study contains the descriptive statistics, regression analysis, and the thematic analysis. The studies were undertaken to test the impact of research capacity, innovation ecosystem and collaborative stakeholder engagement on society and economy (Table 3).

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of major study variables (N = 470)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Research Capacity	4.18	0.61	High
Innovation Ecosystem Strength	4.06	0.67	High
Stakeholder Collaboration	4.22	0.58	Very high
Societal Impact	4.11	0.63	High
Economic Development Impact	4.08	0.65	High

Sources: Author's Fieldwork, 2026

The evaluation reveals that generally, the respondents rated the outcome of research capacity, innovation ecosystem, collaboration of stakeholders, social impact and economic outcome as high. The highest mean score (M = 4.22) was given by the participants to stakeholder collaboration. This denotes that partnerships among universities, industries, government and civil society have proved to be a critical driver of innovation and development. The rating of research capacity was also high, indicating positive perceptions regarding institutional capacity and knowledge production. These results tell us that teamwork and strong systems that conduct research help build societies and improve economies. These findings offer initial evidence concerning the theoretical assumptions and research objectives of the study.

Regression analysis

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the effect of research capacity, innovation ecosystems, and stakeholder collaboration on social impact and economic impact (Table 4).

Table 4. Multiple regressions analysis dependent variable: societal and economic impact

Predictor Variable	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value	Decision
Research Capacity	0.341	6.82	0.000	Significant
Innovation Collaboration	0.287	5.74	0.000	Significant
Stakeholder Collaboration	0.401	8.11	0.000	Significant
Constant	1.213	3.45	0.001	Significant

The regression results confirm that the three predictor variables have a significant impact on society and economy. Collaboration among various stakeholders was the most important predictor of the implementation of strategies, with a β value of 0.401. This was followed by research capacity at 0.341 and innovation ecosystem strength at 0.287. The model accounts for

around 65.9% variance in social and economic impact (R^2=0.659), indicating strong explanatory power (Table 5). Model is statistically fit as denoted by significant F-value. The data presented shows that if stakeholders participate in collaborative networks, research systems, and innovation ecosystems, then the outcome will certainly be development or economic growth. This means that all three null hypotheses are rejected.

Table 5. Model summary

Statistic	Value
R	0.812
R^2	0.659
Adjusted R^2	0.654
F-value	151.76
p-value	0.000

Thematic analysis

Qualitative interviews were conducted with 50 stakeholders for further insights into the factors affecting research, innovation, and collaboration (Table 6).

Table 5. Major themes emerging from qualitative analysis

Theme	Frequency	Representative Observation
Importance of Cross-Sector Collaboration	42	Collaboration enhances innovation outcomes
Need for Sustainable Research Funding	39	Funding shortage hinder impactful research
Week Industry-Academic Linkages	36	Partnerships remain underdevelopment
Policy and Regulation Constraints	31	Bureaucracy delays innovation implementation
Capacity Building and Skills Development	29	Continuous training improves innovation capacity
International Collaboration Benefits	27	Global partnerships strengthen research quality

Sources: Author's Fieldwork, 2026

According to analysis of the theme, stakeholders value collaboration as the most for improving research and innovation results. Most respondents said that partnerships enable sharing of knowledge and resources, as well as solving problems. Another issue raised was sustainable funding, with many participants concerned about the lack of funding for research activities. The innovation performance has been limited by weak industry-academia linkages and policy constraints. Moreover, capacity development and international networking are critical in enhancing the quality and relevance of research to society, said stakeholders. These qualitative findings complement the quantitative results and help us understand the factors that shape innovation ecosystems.

Discussion

This study has shown that research capacity, innovation ecosystems and stakeholder collaboration significantly engender social and economic impact. The descriptive analysis

indicated that the respondents mostly agree that these factors are important to ensuring sustainable development. This finding supports contemporary literature emphasizing the increasing importance of knowledge production and innovation in addressing societal challenges and promoting economic competitiveness. The high mean score for stakeholder collaboration indicates that collaborative networks are essential components of today's innovation systems. The results closely relate to the theory of the quadruple helix which emphasizes interactions of the co-creation of university-industry-government-civil society as key mechanisms for innovating and societal advancement. This shows that when people work together in a friendship way, they have better resources and achieve better results. (Shonubi, 2025) found similar observations whereby collaborative innovation ecosystems achieve better economic and societal outcomes than standalone innovation ecosystems. The capacity to conduct high-quality research strengthens its positive social and economic impact, which underlines the need to invest in research infrastructure, human capital and institutions. Research capacity is the basis for creating knowledge and generating evidence. According to the study, institutions with enhanced research capabilities are predicted to tackle societal challenges and assist with economic development. This result is consistent with previous findings by (Jensen et al., 2025) that strong research systems can effectively enhance the impact of policies, technology, and society.

Stakeholder collaboration was strongest predictor of social and economic impact, say regression analysis. The importance of the partnership-based approach to innovation and development is clear from this finding. The result lending support for Open Innovation Theory posits that organizations may improve innovation performance through the use of external knowledge. Contemporary innovation challenges often need a large range of knowledge. As a result, collaboration in organizational practices often leads to innovative solution development for tackling complex social issues (Ballester-Miquel et al., 2026); (Arsanti et al., 2024). The strength of the innovation ecosystem was also a strong predictor of social and economic impact. The body of literature highlighting the supportive conditions required for the commercialization of knowledge and economic development appears to be consistent with the finding. Ecosystems that promote innovation allow researchers, entrepreneurs, investors, public authorities and citizens to interact. Such interactions allow technology transfer, entrepreneurship and innovation diffusion (Zhang et al., 2023); (Veríssimo et al., 2024). The finding is consistent with (Lee & Dai, 2025) who noted that ecosystem maturity significantly affects regional competitiveness and economic performance.

The analysis of themes sheds light on how research, innovation and collaboration facilitate development outcomes in other ways. Collaboration between different sectors was so important. The quantitative results are therefore strengthened as well as the basic assumptions of the Quadruple Helix. Participants said that relationships help them gain access to certain expertise, funds, and technology. The advantages mentioned augment research productivity and up the chances of successful innovation implementation. The recurring insistence of sustainable funding is a key challenge for systems of research and innovation. Even though respondents recognized the value of research and innovation, many raised issues related to inadequate funding (Allers et al., 2025); (Apgar et al., 2023). This finding aligns with UNESCO (2021), which identified low investment in research as one of the major barriers to scientific progress in many developing economies. Funding mechanisms need to be sustainable to maintain the research infrastructures, support innovation activities and attract talented researchers. The qualitative insight from our data indicates weak industry-academia linkages as another essential theme. Throughout occurrences, recognition to collaboration has grown yet several respondents reported limited interaction. This finding resonates with (Qiao & Niu, 2024), which stresses that the institutional barriers hinder effective knowledge transfer or commercialization. Thus, enhancing innovation performance and

increasing the societal value of research results require effective industry-academia partnershiph(O'Kane et al., 2023); (Yoon et al., 2020).

Policy-related and regulatory-related constraints were also identified as other challenges. According to the respondents, delays in innovation activities and disincentivization of investment takes place often because of bureaucratic procedures as well as inconsistent implementation of policies. The findings support the argument by (Al-Jayyousi et al., 2023); (Lyu, 2026) that mission-oriented governance frameworks can help foster innovation-driven development. It is the place of the government to create the enabling environment for experimentation. The thematic analysis indicates capacity building and skills development are significant; thus, human capital is essential in innovation systems. Knowledge-based economies need highly-skilled people who generate, adapt and apply new knowledge Investing in training and development directly contributes to innovation capacity and long-term competitiveness. The quality and impact of research were influenced by international collaboration. Participants remarked that through working in partnership with the global South, they were able to exchange knowledge and gain access to state-of-the-art technologies and develop research capacity. This finding is consistent with (Wiarda et al., 2024); (Igiri et al., 2021) , who found that research done in international collaboration tends to be better perceived. International networks are thus valuable mechanisms to strengthen research systems and achieve societal outcomes.

Collectively, the findings provide strong empirical support for the integrated theoretical framework adopted in this research. The Quadruple Helix Theory highlights the importance of actors in innovation and how interaction can play a positive role in quality and innovation (Shumate et al., 2023). Further, Open Innovation Theory highlights how one can take advantage of external ideas and internal ideas to go ahead with innovation (Priyono & Hidayat, 2022); (Huang & Zhou, 2025). Finally, the Knowledge Spill over Theory tells about how knowledge created in one firm can be used by other firms and the importance of the outputs of research (Ihejirika & Victor Chizi Ihunda, 2023). The combination of quantitative and qualitative evidence indicates that the societal and economic impacts of research are maximized when research capacity, innovation ecosystems, and collaborative networks work together. In conclusion, strengthening research systems by itself will not lead to sustainable development outcomes, the study shows. Effective innovation requires an ecosystem that offers support, partnerships, funding, policy, and a plan for continued capacity development. By taking action on this interconnected chain, governments, institutions and stakeholders can significantly enhance the social and economic benefits of research and innovation activities.

Conclusion

The research investigated the impact of the innovative ecosystem, research capacity and stakeholders' collaboration on the social and economic impact in modern knowledge economy. The quantitative and qualitative analyses consistently demonstrate that these factors considerably influence development outcomes. The descriptive analysis has shown that stakeholders agree that research and innovation are vital in the face of challenges for society and the economy. The regression analysis showed that research capacity, strength of innovation ecosystem and stakeholder collaboration are significant predictors of social and economic impact, with stakeholder collaboration being the strongest predictor. These results were supplemented by a thematic analysis that highlighted the need for sustainability of funding, industry-academia partnerships, policy support, capacity building and international collaboration. The study proves that research, innovation and collaboration are not isolated processes but mutually reinforcing processes that drive sustainable development. systems and initiatives that produce knowledge that results in innovation that generates solutions and collaborative arrangements that use and

implement knowledge. By combining these processes, solutions can be found for complex problems in society. Competitiveness and quality of life are improved. As a result, policymakers, educational institutions, industries and civil society must focus on collaborative innovation frameworks that can optimize social and economic value. Sustainable investment in research and development or R&D along with innovative ecosystem need the strengthening of institution capacity. Future studies should examine sector-specific innovation ecosystems in the healthcare, agriculture, renewable energy, and digital technology sectors. Research and innovation result would be further contextualised by cross-country, cross-regional comparison studies. Studies using longitudinal research designs should be conducted to study collaborative innovation systems changes over time. Scholars can also study how new technologies such as AI, big data analytics, and digital transformation ae influencing research productivity and societal impact. Future studies should indeed investigate mechanisms through which the innovation ecosystems help in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Recommendations based on stakeholders: Government; Investment & Funding: Increase the R&D budget to 1% of GDP; Collaboration: Promote innovation policies and applied R&D partnerships among government, industry, and academia, aligned with national priorities; Infrastructure & Regulation: Establish innovation hubs and streamline bureaucracy to facilitate the innovation process.

Conflicts of interest

There were no conflicts of interest

Funding

The research and writing of this article were funded by personal funds.

Author contributions

F.N.O: Conceptualization, methodology, software, data curation, writing-original draft preparation. visualization, investigation, supervision, software.: **A.R.O**: Validation, writing-reviewing, and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing

The author(s) acknowledge the use of generative artificial intelligence technologies in drafting parts of this article. Specifically, Grammarly was employed to assist with text polishing and stylistic enhancement. No AI tools were used for generating core scientific data, formulating research hypotheses, or conducting data analysis. The author(s) have verified all outputs and take full accountability for the published work.

References

Al-Hosan, A. M. (2026). Fostering an Entrepreneurial Mindset: A Comparative Study of Systemic Integration in Higher Education. *Sustainability*, *18*(3), 1184. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18031184

Al-Jayyousi, O., Amin, H., Al-Saudi, H. A., Aljassas, A., & Tok, E. (2023). Mission-Oriented Innovation Policy for Sustainable Development: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability*, *15*(17), 13101. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151713101

Alkhazaleh, R., Mykoniatis, K., & Alahmer, A. (2022). The Success of Technology Transfer in the Industry 4.0 Era: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *8*(4), 202. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8040202

Allers, S., Eijkenaar, F., Van Raaij, E. M., & Schut, F. T. (2025). Patterns in the influence of funding and reimbursement on the development and implementation of healthcare innovation: A systematic review. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *11*(1), 100490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2025.100490

Al-Mamary, Y. H., Alshammari, M. M., & Singh, A. (2026). Green entrepreneurial behavior in emerging economies: A mixed-methods model of economic, social, and environmental drivers of sustainable transformation. *Sustainable Futures*, *11*, 101908. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2026.101908

Apgar, M., Fournie, G., Haesler, B., Higdon, G. L., Kenny, L., Oppel, A., Pauls, E., Smith, M., Snijder, M., Vink, D., & Hossain, M. (2023). Revealing the Relational Mechanisms of Research for Development Through Social Network Analysis. *The European Journal of Development Research*, *35*(2), 323–350. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-023-00576-y

Arsanti, T. A., Rupidara, N., & Bondarouk, T. (2024). Managing knowledge flows within open innovation: Knowledge sharing and absorption mechanisms in collaborative innovation. *Cogent Business & Management*, *11*(1), 2351832. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2351832

Ballester-Miquel, J. C., Perez-Ruiz, P., Gisbert-Muñoz, S., & Enri-Peiró, S. (2026). The role of soft skills in workplace innovation: Leadership and problem-solving as key drivers. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *12*, 100901. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100901

Bera, S., De Leon, C. S., & Lewenstein, B. V. (2026). Insights for inclusive upstream engagement with migrant farmworkers in agriculture: A case study from the US–Mexico border. *Ambio*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-026-02383-1

Carbajo, R., & Cabeza, L. F. (2022). Researchers' perspective within responsible implementation with socio-technical approaches. An example from solar energy research centre in Chile. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *158*, 112132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2022.112132

Dreyer, M., Chefneux, L., Goldberg, A., Von Heimburg, J., Patrignani, N., Schofield, M., & Shilling, C. (2017). Responsible Innovation: A Complementary View from Industry with Proposals for Bridging Different Perspectives. *Sustainability*, *9*(10), 1719. https://doi.org/10.3390/su9101719

Feng, B., & Jalali, M. (2024). The Influence of Technological Innovation Capability on Sustainable Supply Chain Management Implementation—Evidence from Patent-Intensive Industries. *Sustainability*, *16*(12), 5183. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16125183

Hasche, N., Höglund, L., & Linton, G. (2020). Quadruple helix as a network of relationships: Creating value within a Swedish regional innovation system. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *32*(6), 523–544. https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2019.1643134

Huang, J., & Zhou, P. (2025). Open Innovation and Entrepreneurship: A Review from the Perspective of Sustainable Business Models. *Sustainability*, *17*(3), 939. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17030939

Igiri, B. E., Okoduwa, S. I. R., Akabuogu, E. P., Okoduwa, U. J., Enang, I. A., Idowu, O. O., Abdullahi, S., Onukak, I. E., Onuruka, C. C., Christopher, O. P. O., Salawu, A. O., Chris, A. O., & Onyemachi, D. I. (2021). Focused Research on the Challenges and Productivity of Researchers in Nigerian Academic Institutions Without Funding. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, *6*, 727228. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2021.727228

Ihejirika, Dr. C. & Victor Chizi Ihunda. (2023). Roderick Chisholm on Reliabilism: Implications for Epistemic Indubitability. *Radinka Journal Of Science And Systematic Literature Review*, *1*(3), 202–210. https://doi.org/10.56778/rjslr.v1i3.169

Jensen, E., Noles, S., Reed, M., & Lang, P. (2025). How can a research program influence public policy? Evaluating a decade of research impact using an evidence-based theory of change. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *171*, 104182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2025.104182

Klintman, M., Jonsson, A., Grafström, M., & Torgilsson, P. (2022). Academia and society in collaborative knowledge production towards urban sustainability: Several schemes—three common crossroads. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *27*(9), 20519–20538. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-022-02564-4

Lee, J., & Dai, Y. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Data-Driven Technology in the Public Policy Cycle: Comparative Applications, Opportunities, and Risks. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, *27*(5–6), 477–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2025.2598371

Lubberink, R., Blok, V., Van Ophem, J., & Omta, O. (2017). Lessons for Responsible Innovation in the Business Context: A Systematic Literature Review of Responsible, Social and Sustainable Innovation Practices. *Sustainability*, *9*(5), 721. https://doi.org/10.3390/su9050721

Lyu, Y. (2026). GICM with Innovation & Governance Development Index (IGDI): A Framework for Economic Governance and Innovation-Driven Development in the Coastal and Marine Industry. *Journal of The Institution of Engineers (India): Series C*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40032-026-01386-x

Mai, K. N., & Nguyen, V. T. (2023). Entrepreneurial ecosystem affects organisational learning, creativity and success. *Cogent Business & Management*, *10*(3), 2260125. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2260125

Matthews, N. E., Stamford, L., & Shapira, P. (2019). Aligning sustainability assessment with responsible research and innovation: Towards a framework for Constructive Sustainability Assessment. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, *20*, 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2019.05.002

Moreira, A., Navaia, E., & Ribau, C. (2024). Innovation capabilities and their dimensions: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Innovation Studies*, *8*(3), 313–333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijis.2024.07.001

O'Kane, C., Zhang, J. A., Haar, J., & Cunningham, J. A. (2023). How scientists interpret and address funding criteria: Value creation and undesirable side effects. *Small Business Economics*, *61*(2), 799–826. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-022-00697-4

Petropoulos, F., Akkermans, H., Aksin, O. Z., Ali, I., Babai, M. Z., Barbosa-Povoa, A., Battaïa, O., Besiou, M., Boysen, N., Brammer, S., Brandon-Jones, A., Briskorn, D., Browning, T. R., Buijs, P., Centobelli, P., Chiarini, A., Cousins, P., Cudney, E. A., Davies, A., … Zheng, T. (2026). Operations & supply chain management: Principles and practice. *International Journal of Production Research*, *64*(1), 330–513. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2025.2555531

Priyono, A., & Hidayat, A. (2022). Dynamic Capabilities for Open Innovation: A Typology of Pathways toward Aligning Resources, Strategies and Capabilities. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *8*(4), 206. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8040206

Qiao, N., & Niu, L. (2024). The Impact of the Industrial Innovation Ecosystem on Innovation Performance—Using the Equipment Manufacturing Industry as an Example. *Systems*, *12*(12), 578. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12120578

Regan, Á. (2021). Exploring the readiness of publicly funded researchers to practice responsible research and innovation in digital agriculture. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, *8*(1), 28–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2021.1904755

Roman, M., Varga, H., Cvijanovic, V., & Reid, A. (2020). Quadruple Helix Models for Sustainable Regional Innovation: Engaging and Facilitating Civil Society Participation. *Economies*, *8*(2), 48. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies8020048

Schütz, F., Heidingsfelder, M. L., & Schraudner, M. (2019). Co-shaping the Future in Quadruple Helix Innovation Systems: Uncovering Public Preferences toward Participatory Research and Innovation. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, *5*(2), 128–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sheji.2019.04.002

Shonubi, O. A. (2025). Innovation challenges of digital transformation: Transitioning legacy to the future. *Sustainable Futures*, *10*, 100971. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.100971

Shumate, M., Dougherty, S. M., Miles, J.-P., Boyer, A.-M., Wang, R., Gibson, Z. M., & Cooper, K. R. (2023). Network Effectiveness in Context. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *33*(4), 716–729. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muad003

Thapa, R. K., Iakovleva, T., & Foss, L. (2019). Responsible research and innovation: A systematic review of the literature and its applications to regional studies. *European Planning Studies*, *27*(12), 2470–2490. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2019.1625871

Urbano, D., Aparicio, S., Heaton, S., & Boudreaux, C. (2026). The role of entrepreneurial education and autonomous culture in enhancing entrepreneurs' dynamic capabilities: A global analysis of national effects. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *22*(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-026-01169-x

Veríssimo, C., Pereira, L., Fernandes, A., & Martinho, R. (2024). Complex problem solving as a source of competitive advantage. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *10*(2), 100258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100258

Wesselow, M., Grothmann, T., & Siebenhüner, B. (2025). Opening up and closing down citizen participation in the development of a sustainable neighborhood energy system. *Energy, Sustainability and Society*, *15*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13705-025-00515-1

Wiarda, M., Janssen, M. J., Coenen, T. B. J., & Doorn, N. (2024). Responsible mission governance: An integrative framework and research agenda. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, *50*, 100820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2024.100820

Yoon, J., Sung, S., & Ryu, D. (2020). The Role of Networks in Improving International Performance and Competitiveness: Perspective View of Open Innovation. *Sustainability*, *12*(3), 1269. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031269

Zhang, W., Zeng, X., Liang, H., Xue, Y., & Cao, X. (2023). Understanding How Organizational Culture Affects Innovation Performance: A Management Context Perspective. *Sustainability*, *15*(8), 6644. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086644