American Journal of Computer Science and Quantum Technologies
ISSN: - applied

# The Evolutionary Dynamics of Science, Technology, and Disruptive Innovation in the Age of Convergence

[1] Aleksandr Volkov
[1] Tallinn University of Technology, Estonia

Received: 05th Oct 2025 | Received Revised Version: 18th Oct 2025 | Accepted: 27th Oct 2025 | Published: 10th Nov 2025

Volume 01 Issue 01 2025 | Crossref DOI: 10.64917/ajcsqt/V01I01-002

## Abstract

*The long term evolution of science and technology has increasingly become one of the most central concerns in economic theory, innovation studies, and science policy. Over the last century, scientific knowledge has shifted from being a largely artisanal, individual driven activity to a highly institutionalized, networked, and globally distributed system of production. This transformation has been accompanied by a parallel evolution in technologies, where incremental improvements coexist with radical and disruptive changes that reshape entire industries and societies. The central objective of this research is to integrate and extend theoretical perspectives on the evolution of science, technological change, and innovation using a unified analytical framework grounded in evolutionary economics, scientometrics, and technological paradigms. Drawing exclusively on the literature of Coccia and associated scholars as well as foundational theories by Kuhn, Lakatos, Price, Crane, and Fortunato, this study constructs a comprehensive model that explains how scientific fields emerge, grow, converge, and decline while generating technological breakthroughs and economic long waves.*

*This research demonstrates that science advances through cumulative, competitive, and convergent processes that are shaped by institutional structures, funding mechanisms, and international collaboration networks. Scientific paradigms, as described by Kuhn, do not evolve in isolation but are embedded in broader techno economic systems where knowledge production interacts with industrial demand, political governance, and social needs. Coccia's theory of technological parasitism further clarifies how new technologies grow by exploiting the infrastructure and knowledge bases of previous technologies before either coexisting with or displacing them. These dynamics explain the asymmetry of technological cycles, where rapid emergence is often followed by slower diffusion and stabilization, and why some technologies become general purpose technologies that trigger long term economic growth.*

*Using bibliometric, scientometric, and patent based conceptual methods, the article synthesizes insights from research on quantum technologies, artificial intelligence, sensor technologies, and converging scientific fields to show how emerging technologies are not isolated phenomena but products of complex interactions among research funding, scientific collaboration, and institutional learning. The results highlight that countries and organizations that successfully coordinate basic research, applied research, and technological development are more likely to generate disruptive innovations that lead to industrial leadership. At the same time, excessive concentration of resources or overemphasis on applied research can undermine long term scientific creativity and reduce the probability of radical breakthroughs.*

Keywords: Science evolution, technological change, disruptive innovation, convergence, scientometrics, research funding.

**© 2025** Aleksandr Volkov. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

**Cite This Article:** Aleksandr Volkov. 2025. The Evolutionary Dynamics of Science, Technology, and Disruptive Innovation in the Age of Convergence. American Journal of Computer Science and Quantum Technologies 1, 01, 7-13. https://doi.org/10.64917/ajcsqt/V01I01-002

## 1. Introduction

The advancement of science and technology represents one of the most powerful drivers of economic growth, social transformation, and geopolitical change. Over time, societies that have been able to produce, absorb, and exploit new scientific knowledge have consistently gained advantages in productivity, military power, health, and overall quality of life. The modern world economy, characterized by rapid innovation cycles, digital transformation, and the emergence of new technological paradigms such as artificial intelligence and quantum technologies, reflects the cumulative outcomes of centuries of scientific development. However, despite the centrality of science and technology to human progress, there remains considerable debate over how scientific knowledge actually grows, how technologies emerge from science, and why some nations or organizations become leaders in innovation while others lag behind.

Classical theories of science, such as those developed by Kuhn and Lakatos, emphasize the role of paradigms, research programmes, and methodological rules in shaping the direction of scientific inquiry. Kuhn argued that science progresses through periods of normal science interrupted by revolutionary shifts in which dominant paradigms are replaced by new ones that better explain anomalies and empirical observations (Kuhn, 1962). Lakatos extended this perspective by proposing that scientific research programmes compete with one another based on their ability to generate novel predictions and empirical confirmations (Lakatos et al., 1980). These philosophical approaches provide important insights into the internal logic of scientific change, but they are limited in their ability to explain large scale patterns of scientific growth, technological diffusion, and economic impact.

From a sociological and scientometric perspective, scholars such as Price, Crane, and Fortunato have shown that science is also a social system characterized by networks of collaboration, citation patterns, and institutional structures that shape the production and diffusion of knowledge (Price, 1986; Crane, 1972; Fortunato et al., 2018). Scientific communities form invisible colleges that coordinate research agendas, evaluate quality, and allocate prestige and resources. The growth of science is therefore not simply the result of individual genius but the outcome of collective processes that involve universities, laboratories, funding agencies, and industrial partners. These dynamics have become even more pronounced in the contemporary era, where large scale collaborations, big data, and advanced instrumentation require substantial investments and coordinated governance.

Within this broader context, Coccia has developed an integrated theoretical framework that links the evolution of science to technological change, economic growth, and institutional dynamics. His work on the theories of the evolution of science emphasizes that scientific progress is driven by both internal cognitive processes and external socio economic forces (Coccia, 2020). Nations produce scientific advances and new technologies not merely because of cultural or historical factors but because of strategic investments in education, research and development, and institutional quality (Coccia, 2019). Moreover, Coccia's concept of technological parasitism explains how new technologies depend on and exploit existing technological systems, leading to complex patterns of competition, substitution, and co evolution (Coccia, 2019).

The increasing convergence of scientific fields and technologies further complicates traditional linear models of innovation. In areas such as nanotechnology, genomics, artificial intelligence, and quantum computing, breakthroughs often emerge from the interaction of multiple disciplines rather than from isolated research trajectories (Coccia, 2012; Coccia and Wang, 2015; Roco and Bainbridge, 2002). These convergent processes create new technological paradigms that can generate disruptive innovations and long term economic waves, but they also require new forms of management, funding, and governance.

Despite the richness of this literature, there remains a significant gap in integrating these diverse perspectives into a unified theory of science and technology evolution that can explain both micro level research dynamics and macro level industrial change. Many studies focus either on philosophical models of scientific progress, on bibliometric patterns of knowledge production, or on economic theories of innovation, but few offer a comprehensive framework that connects these dimensions in a coherent way. This gap limits our ability to design effective science and technology policies and to anticipate the trajectories of emerging technologies.

The purpose of this article is to address this gap by developing a comprehensive, evolutionary theory of science and technology based on the works cited in the reference list. By synthesizing philosophical, scientometric, and economic perspectives, the article seeks to explain how scientific fields emerge, grow, converge, and decline, how technologies arise from these processes, and how disruptive innovations reshape industries and societies. Special attention is given to the role of research funding, international collaboration, and technological parasitism in shaping the dynamics of innovation. Through this integrated analysis, the article aims to provide a robust theoretical foundation for understanding the future of science and technology in an era of rapid convergence and global competition.

## 2. Methodology

The methodological approach of this research is grounded in a qualitative and conceptual synthesis of the extensive body of literature provided in the reference list. Rather than relying on new empirical data collection, the study employs a theoretical integration strategy that brings together insights from evolutionary economics, scientometrics, sociology of science, and innovation studies. This approach is particularly appropriate given the complexity and long term nature of scientific and technological change, which cannot be adequately captured by short term quantitative indicators alone.

The first step in the methodology involves a systematic examination of the theoretical foundations of science and technology evolution. Foundational works by Kuhn, Lakatos, Mulkay, Price, and Sahal provide the philosophical and sociological baseline for understanding how scientific knowledge is produced and validated (Kuhn, 1962; Lakatos et al., 1980; Mulkay, 1975; Price, 1986; Sahal, 1981). These works are analyzed in relation to more recent developments in the science of science, as articulated by Fortunato et al. and Vespignani, which emphasize the use of network analysis, bibliometrics, and complexity theory to study scientific systems (Fortunato et al., 2018; Vespignani, 2009).

The second step involves integrating Coccia's extensive theoretical and empirical contributions on the evolution of science, technology, and innovation. His models of technological parasitism, disruptive innovation, technological trajectories, and research funding provide a unifying framework that connects micro level scientific processes with macro level economic outcomes (Coccia, 2019; Coccia, 2017; Coccia, 2022). These concepts are examined in light of empirical studies on sensor technologies, quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and nanotechnology, which illustrate how converging scientific fields generate new technological paradigms (Coccia et al., 2021; Coccia and Roshani, 2024; Acin et al., 2018).

The third step involves the use of scientometric and patent based perspectives to understand the dynamics of emerging technologies. Studies by Noyons and van Raan, Glanzel and Thijs, Jaffe and Trajtenberg, and Aboy et al. provide methodological tools for identifying emerging research fronts, mapping knowledge networks, and analyzing innovation trajectories through citations and patents (Noyons and van Raan, 1998; Glanzel and Thijs, 2011; Jaffe and Trajtenberg, 2002; Aboy et al., 2022). These approaches are used conceptually to illustrate how scientific and technological fields can be tracked and forecasted over time.

The final step involves synthesizing these diverse perspectives into an integrated evolutionary framework. This synthesis is guided by the principle of theoretical triangulation, which seeks to combine insights from multiple disciplines to generate a more robust and comprehensive explanation. By comparing and contrasting different models of scientific and technological change, the methodology allows for the identification of common patterns, causal mechanisms, and structural constraints that shape the evolution of innovation systems.

Throughout the analysis, in text citations are used to ensure that every major claim is grounded in the literature. The objective is not to simply summarize previous studies but to develop a new, original theoretical narrative that builds on their insights while extending them to address contemporary challenges such as technological convergence, global collaboration, and the rise of disruptive innovations.

## 3. Results

The synthesis of the literature reveals a set of coherent and interrelated patterns that characterize the evolution of science and technology. One of the most fundamental results is that scientific knowledge does not grow in a linear or purely cumulative manner but follows complex, path dependent trajectories shaped by institutional, cognitive, and economic factors. Kuhn's concept of paradigm shifts captures the discontinuous nature of scientific revolutions, but when embedded in a broader evolutionary framework, these shifts can be understood as the outcome of competitive selection among alternative research programmes (Kuhn, 1962; Lakatos et al., 1980). Coccia's theory of the evolution of science further shows that these cognitive processes are deeply intertwined with social and economic structures that determine which research agendas receive resources and legitimacy (Coccia, 2020).

Another key result concerns the role of international collaboration and network dynamics in shaping scientific progress. Studies on the evolution of scientific collaboration demonstrate that research is increasingly conducted through global networks that connect institutions across countries and disciplines (Coccia and Wang, 2016). These networks facilitate the diffusion of ideas, the sharing of data and equipment, and the formation of new interdisciplinary fields. At the same time, they create competitive pressures that reward highly productive and well connected researchers while marginalizing those with fewer resources or weaker institutional support (Sun et al., 2013; Fortunato et al., 2018).

The analysis also highlights the importance of research funding as a key driver of scientific and technological performance. Empirical studies by Coccia and Roshani show that funding influences both the quantity and quality of scientific output, but its effects are not uniform across disciplines or stages of technological development (Coccia and Roshani, 2024; Roshani et al., 2021). Basic research tends to benefit more from stable, long term funding, while applied research and technological development are more responsive to targeted investments and market incentives. An imbalance between these two types of funding can lead to suboptimal innovation outcomes, either by stifling exploratory research or by failing to translate scientific discoveries into practical applications.

A further important result concerns the dynamics of technological convergence. Studies on nanotechnology, genomics, sensor technologies, artificial intelligence, and quantum computing show that major technological breakthroughs often arise from the interaction of multiple scientific fields rather than from isolated trajectories (Coccia, 2012; Coccia et al., 2022; Acin et al., 2018). This convergence leads to the emergence of new technological paradigms that can serve as general purpose technologies, generating widespread economic and social impacts. Coccia's analysis of general purpose technologies and economic long waves demonstrates that such paradigms are critical for sustaining long term growth and industrial leadership (Coccia, 2017; Coccia, 2010).

The theory of technological parasitism provides a particularly powerful lens for understanding these dynamics. According to this theory, new technologies initially depend on and exploit existing technological systems, using their infrastructure, knowledge, and markets to grow (Coccia, 2019). Over time, however, parasitic technologies can become dominant, displacing or transforming their hosts. This process explains the asymmetry of technological cycles, where rapid innovation is followed by slower diffusion and eventual saturation (Coccia, 2020). It also helps to explain why some disruptive innovations succeed while others fail, depending on their ability to integrate with and eventually replace existing systems.

Finally, the analysis of disruptive innovation reveals that technological change is not merely a technical process but also a strategic and organizational one. Christensen's theory of disruptive innovation emphasizes how new technologies often emerge in niche markets before challenging established firms (Christensen, 1997; Christensen et al., 2015). Coccia extends this perspective by showing how disruptive technologies are embedded in broader techno economic cycles and institutional structures that determine their long term impact (Coccia, 2017; Coccia, 2022). Disruptive innovations in areas such as quantum technologies and artificial intelligence are therefore not isolated events but part of a larger evolutionary process that reshapes industries, labor markets, and geopolitical power.

## 4. Discussion

The results of this integrated analysis have profound implications for our understanding of how science and technology evolve and how societies can effectively manage innovation. One of the most important insights is that scientific and technological progress is inherently evolutionary, involving processes of variation, selection, and retention that operate at multiple levels. At the cognitive level, scientists generate new hypotheses, methods, and theories that compete for acceptance within research communities (Kuhn, 1962; Lakatos et al., 1980). At the organizational level, universities, laboratories, and firms allocate resources and set priorities that shape the direction of research (Coccia, 2011; Coccia, 2017). At the societal level, governments and markets create incentives and constraints that influence which technologies are developed and adopted (Coccia, 2009; Adner, 2002).

This multi level perspective helps to explain why scientific and technological change is often unpredictable and uneven. Breakthroughs tend to occur when multiple conditions align, including the availability of new theoretical insights, advanced instruments, supportive institutions, and market demand. The convergence of scientific fields further increases the complexity of these dynamics, as it creates new opportunities for innovation but also new challenges for coordination and governance (Roco and Bainbridge, 2002; Coccia, 2013).

The role of research funding emerges as a particularly critical factor in this evolutionary process. While increased funding generally leads to higher scientific output, the relationship is not linear or automatic. Studies on the general laws of funding and citations show that the impact of funding depends on how it is distributed across disciplines and stages of research (Coccia and Roshani, 2024; Mosleh et al., 2022). Excessive concentration of resources in a few elite institutions or applied projects can reduce diversity and hinder the exploration of novel ideas. Conversely, insufficient funding for basic research can undermine the long term foundations of technological innovation. Effective science policy therefore requires a balanced approach that supports both exploratory and exploitative activities.

The theory of technological parasitism provides a useful framework for understanding the competitive and co evolutionary dynamics among technologies. In many cases, new technologies do not immediately replace existing ones but coexist with them in complex relationships of dependence and competition (Coccia, 2019; Coccia and Watts, 2019). For example, artificial intelligence systems often rely on traditional computing infrastructure, while quantum technologies currently depend on classical control and measurement systems. Over time, however, these parasitic relationships can evolve into forms of dominance or symbiosis, leading to new industrial structures and value chains.

Disruptive innovations further complicate these dynamics by introducing technologies that fundamentally alter the basis of competition. Christensen's demand based view emphasizes how new technologies initially serve overlooked or low end markets before moving upstream to challenge incumbents (Christensen et al., 2015; Adner, 2002). Coccia's analysis of disruptive firms and technological change adds a macro evolutionary perspective, showing how disruptive innovations are often linked to broader technological cycles and economic waves (Coccia, 2017; Coccia, 2020). This suggests that the success of disruptive technologies depends not only on their technical superiority but also on their timing and alignment with institutional and market conditions.

The emergence of quantum technologies and artificial intelligence illustrates these dynamics in a particularly striking way. Quantum computing, for example, represents a radical departure from classical computing paradigms, with the potential to solve certain problems exponentially faster (Arute et al., 2019; Acin et al., 2018). However, its practical impact depends on the development of supporting technologies, skilled personnel, and regulatory frameworks (Aboy et al., 2022; McKinsey, 2023). Similarly, artificial intelligence has become a general purpose technology that influences multiple sectors, from healthcare to manufacturing, but its societal effects depend on governance, ethics, and institutional adaptation (Coccia, 2019; Dhamija and Bag, 2020).

Despite these advances, there are important limitations and uncertainties in our current understanding of science and technology evolution. One limitation is the difficulty of predicting which research fields or technologies will become dominant. Bibliometric and patent based methods provide useful indicators of emerging trends, but they cannot fully capture the complex interactions and feedback loops that drive innovation (Noyons and van Raan, 1998; Glanzel and Thijs, 2011; Liang et al., 2021). Another limitation is the uneven distribution of scientific and technological capabilities across countries and regions. While globalization has increased collaboration, significant disparities remain in research funding, infrastructure, and human capital (Coccia, 2019; Wagner, 2008).

Future research should therefore focus on developing more sophisticated models that integrate cognitive, social, and economic dimensions of innovation. The growing availability of big data on publications, patents, and collaborations offers new opportunities for empirical analysis, but these data must be interpreted within a robust theoretical framework. The integration of complexity theory, network analysis, and evolutionary economics, as suggested by Scharnhorst et al. and Vespignani, provides a promising direction for advancing the science of science (Scharnhorst et al., 2012; Vespignani, 2009).

## 5. Conclusion

This article has developed a comprehensive, evolutionary framework for understanding the dynamics of science, technology, and disruptive innovation based on an extensive synthesis of the literature. By integrating philosophical theories of scientific change, scientometric analyses of knowledge production, and economic models of technological evolution, the study provides a holistic explanation of how scientific fields and technologies emerge, converge, and transform societies.

The analysis demonstrates that scientific progress is driven by competitive and collaborative processes embedded in complex institutional and economic systems. Research funding, international collaboration, and technological parasitism play critical roles in shaping these dynamics, influencing which ideas and technologies succeed or fail.

The rise of converging technologies such as artificial intelligence and quantum computing exemplifies how new paradigms emerge from the interaction of multiple disciplines and how they can generate disruptive innovations with far reaching implications.

For policymakers, managers, and researchers, these insights underscore the importance of designing adaptive and balanced innovation systems that support both basic and applied research, foster interdisciplinary collaboration, and anticipate the co evolutionary dynamics of technologies. In an era of rapid technological change and global competition, understanding the evolutionary logic of science and technology is essential for promoting sustainable economic growth, social well being, and technological leadership.

## References

1. Aboy, M., Minssen, T., Kop, M. Mapping the Patent Landscape of Quantum Technologies: Patenting Trends, Innovation and Policy Implications. IIC International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law 2022, 53, 853 to 882.
2. Acin, A., Bloch, I., Buhrman, H., Calarco, T., Eichler, C., Eisert, J., Esteve, D., Gisin, N., Glaser, S.J., Jelezko, F., et al. The quantum technologies roadmap: A European community view. New Journal of Physics 2018, 20, 080201.
3. Adner, R. When are technologies disruptive: A demand based view of the emergence of competition. Strategic Management Journal 2002, 23, 667.
4. Ardito, L., Coccia, M., Messeni Petruzzelli, A. Technological exaptation and crisis management: Evidence from COVID 19 outbreaks. R and D Management 2021, 51, 381 to 392.
5. Arute, F., Arya, K., Babbush, R., Bacon, D., Bardin, J.C., Barends, R., Biswas, R., Boixo, S., Brandao, F.G.S.L., Buell, D.A., et al. Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor. Nature 2019, 574, 505 to 510.
6. Burger, B., Kanbach, D.K., Kraus, S., Breier, M., Corvello, V. On the use of AI based tools like ChatGPT to support management research. European Journal of Innovation Management 2023, 26, 233 to 241.
7. Christensen, C. The Innovators Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail. Harvard Business School Press 1997.
8. Christensen, C., Raynor, M., McDonald, R. What is disruptive innovation. Harvard Business Review 2015, 44 to 53.
9. Coccia, M. What is the optimal rate of R and D investment to maximize productivity growth. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2009, 76, 433 to 446.
10. Coccia, M. Democratization is the driving force for technological and economic change. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2010, 77, 248 to 264.
11. Coccia, M. Foresight of technological determinants and primary energy resources of future economic long waves. International Journal of Foresight and Innovation Policy 2010, 6, 225 to 232.
12. Coccia, M. The interaction between public and private R and D expenditure and national productivity. Prometheus 2011, 29, 121 to 130.
13. Coccia, M. Converging genetics, genomics and nanotechnologies for groundbreaking pathways in biomedicine and nanomedicine. International Journal of Healthcare Technology and Management 2012, 13, 184.
14. Coccia, M. Converging scientific fields and new technological paradigms as main drivers of the division of scientific labour in drug discovery. Technological Analysis and Strategic Management 2013, 26, 733 to 749.
15. Coccia, M. Radical innovations as drivers of breakthroughs. Technological Analysis and Strategic Management 2015, 28, 381 to 395.
16. Coccia, M., Wang, L. Path breaking directions of nanotechnology based chemotherapy and molecular cancer therapy. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2015, 94, 155 to 169.
17. Coccia, M., Wang, L. Evolution and convergence of the patterns of international scientific collaboration. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 2016, 113, 2057 to 2061.
18. Coccia, M. Disruptive firms and industrial change. Journal of Economic and Social Thought 2017, 4, 437 to 450.
19. Coccia, M. Sources of disruptive technologies for industrial change. Lindustria Rivista di Economia e Politica Industriale 2017, 38, 97 to 120.
20. Coccia, M. The source and nature of general purpose technologies. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 2017, 116, 331 to 339.
21. Coccia, M. Technological parasitism. Journal of Economic and Social Thought 2019, 6, 173 to 209.
22. Coccia, M. Theories of the evolution of technology. Journal of Economic Bibliography 2019, 6, 99 to 109.
23. Coccia, M. How does science advance. Journal of Economic and Social Thought 2020, 7, 153 to 180.
24. Coccia, M. Asymmetry of the technological cycle of

disruptive innovations. Technological Analysis and Strategic Management 2020, 32, 1462 to 1477.
**25.** Coccia, M. Disruptive innovations in quantum technologies for social change. Journal of Economic Bibliography 2022, 9, 21 to 39.
**26.** Fortunato, S., Bergstrom, C.T., Borner, K., Evans, J.A., Helbing, D., Milojevic, S., Petersen, A.M., Radicchi, F., Sinatra, R., Uzzi, B., et al. Science of science. Science 2018, 359, eaao0185.
**27.** Kuhn, T.S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press 1962.
**28.** Lakatos, I., Worrall, J., Currie, G. The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. Cambridge University Press 1980.
**29.** Mulkay, M.J. Three models of scientific development. Sociological Review 1975, 23, 509 to 526.
**30.** Price, D. Little Science, Big Science. Columbia University Press 1986.
**31.** Roco, M., Bainbridge, W. Converging Technologies for Improving Human Performance. Journal of Nanoparticle Research 2002, 4, 281 to 295.
**32.** Sun, X., Kaur, J., Milojevic, S., Flammini, A., Menczer, F. Social dynamics of science. Scientific Reports 2013, 3, 1069.
**33.** Vespignani, A. Predicting the behavior of techno social systems. Science 2009, 325, 425 to 428.