

Exploring team roles for social innovation labs: toward a competence-based self-assessment approach

Ferney Osorio^{a,b}, Fabio A. Cruz Sanchez^a, Laurent Dupont^a, Mauricio Camargo^a

^a *Université de Lorraine - ERPI -F-54000, Nancy, France,*

^b *Departamento de Ingeniería de Sistemas e Industrial, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia*

Abstract

Recently, there has been a great interest in the development of innovations labs as intermediate means to fostering social innovative solutions to wicked problems. However, understanding how lab teams are assembled including the underlying competences and main roles inside of these organizational structures is still yet to be addressed. This aspect is of paramount importance at the early-design phase to foster the future development and consolidation of such initiatives. A competence-based role model is proposed as a basis for guiding the conformation of social innovation lab teams. The model has been structured from (1) a set of 14 competences for social innovation labs retrieved from the literature, (2) a comparison of 7 frameworks of innovation team roles and (3) authors experience. The proposed model is then operationalized through a self-assessment approach composed of an online questionnaire and a retrospective workshop aiming to allow team members to position themselves in terms of the potential role that they could perform for their team but also to elicit improvement strategies. The self-assessment methodology is then applied among 10 Latin American nascent social innovation lab teams with focus on climate change challenges. Insights and implications of this exploratory study for both researchers and practitioners are then discussed.

Key words: innovation lab, social innovation, innovation team roles, innovation competences, self-assessment

1. Introduction

Today's most critical challenges demand systemic ways to tackle them. Climate change, environmental degradation, health crisis, education inequalities, and employment and poverty reduction are some examples of those wicked problems characterized by their complexity, their interdependencies and their context specificity (Zivkovic, 2018). Social Innovation (SI) then emerges as a research strand for not only helping to understand these societal issues but to facilitate the development of systemic strategies toward a transformative change of social practices in order to solve social problems and meeting local demands (Strasser, Kraker, & Kemp, 2019).

*Corresponding Author
Preprint submitted to Creativity and Innovation Management
Email address: ferney.osorio-bustamante@univ-lorraine.fr (Ferney Osorio) May 5, 2021

In particular, the notion of SI Labs has recently become a subject of interest in the literature. SI labs emerge as an approach to keep up with increasing changes and accumulating challenges that society deals with and where more conventional approaches relying solely on techno-centric approaches fall short (Jeziński et al., 2014; Westley et al., 2015). Innovation labs are defined as semi-autonomous organizations dedicated to facilitate innovation processes by allowing multi-stakeholders groups to interact in open collaboration with the purpose of creating and prototyping solutions to systemic challenges while strengthening people’s innovative and technological competences (Gryszkiewicz, Lykourantzou, & Toivonen, 2016; M. Lewis & Moultrie, 2005; Zivkovic, 2018). In this sense, SI labs act as cross-pollinators of knowledge, creating dialogue, mixing voices, allowing for new ideas to appear and to be translated into alternative solutions (Wascher, Kaletka, & Schultze, 2019). The way these organizational forms perform often depends on the problem that is being addressed and the context they belong to. This means that the people, the organizations involved and even the methods applied within a SI lab are constantly changing (Wascher, Hebel, Schrot, & Schultze, 2018).

The changing and permeable nature of the “lab” phenomenon represents a complex working environment which often leads to conditions of uncertainty. This is something on which authors have raised concerns, suggesting that those teams in charge of leading an innovation lab should be able to deal with ambiguities, integrate multiple perspectives and facilitate the work across-disciplines (McGann, Wells, & Blomkamp, 2019; Ferney; Osorio, Dupont, Camargo, Sandoval, & Peña, 2020). There is an increasing interest in how innovation labs can be used to address societal problems (McGann, Wells, & Blomkamp, 2019); governments, companies, universities, and even communities are continuously turning to the implementation of their own “lab.” They are becoming vectors for fostering collaborative learning, inclusive entrepreneurial thinking, systemic change and the transfer of innovation capabilities (Camargo, Morel, & Lhoste, 2021; Delgado, Galvez, Hassan, Palominos, & Morel, 2020; Rayna & Striukova, 2019; RezaeeVessal2021?). However, several questions arise when considering how the teams managing these initiatives should be composed and organized (J. M. Lewis, 2020; Zivkovic, 2018). This aspect is of paramount importance, especially at the early-design phase to foster the future development and consolidation of such initiatives.

In fact, the assembling of innovation teams has been a matter of interest for a long time. Both practitioners and scholars from public and private sectors have addressed and shared their experiences in the nature and characteristics of innovations teams across time. This is a vision that has been in constant evolution, referring for instance to the 80’s where corporate-type innovation teams, whose nature depended mainly on the emergence of those ‘champions’ capable of overcoming any obstacle, while additional roles were organized towards supporting them (Jenssen & Jørgensen (2004)). Then, as the adoption of open innovation practices became more widespread, the idea of innovation teams has progressively become more agile and adaptive, opening the door to the integration of multiple disciplines, and being the inspiration for new ways of work and

67 collaboration (Hering & Phillips, 2005; Hellstrom2002?; Gemünden2007?).
 68 While the perception of lonely innovators and isolated teams seems to persist
 69 today, the increasing interconnection and complexity of the problems that we
 70 face as society, the amount of information and knowledge that is continuously
 71 created, and the challenging task of making critical decisions with unforeseeable
 72 repercussions, are evidence on why today’s innovation teams are called to be
 73 able to efficiently collaborate under a multitude of perspectives, disciplines and
 74 cultures (Björklund2017?; Puttick2014teams?).

75 This is not a minor issue since it is in people where the success of every
 76 innovation process of an organization lies (Leonard1995?). Thus, understanding
 77 the dynamics of group work and team performance has been a topic of interest
 78 for the scientific community. In this regard, previous studies have tackled this
 79 issue from several perspectives. In terms of team theory for instance, Belbin
 80 (2010) gathers in her book an extensive research that resumes her proposition of
 81 the nine key team roles at work. Originally published in 1993, Belbin explains
 82 in her work why roles in a team are in fact the sum up of multiple factors
 83 such as personal traits, knowledge, skills, experience and even situations that
 84 will determine a person’s behaviour in group work or in a specific job. More
 85 specifically studies on innovation teams as the ones by (Kratzer2006b?) have
 86 focused on examining how factors such as team communication, conflicts or
 87 virtuality influence creativity performance. Likewise, DeCusatis (2008) pointed
 88 out how team performance varies based on generational preferences, habits
 89 and the nature of the intended innovation. Precisely, this changing nature of
 90 the innovation process across time has opened the door for not only asking
 91 which roles are required but also what are the competences needed for successful
 92 innovation teams.

93 That is why researches like these of (Chatenier, Verstegen, Biemans, Mulder,
 94 & Omta, 2010) and (Podmetina, Soderquist, Petraite, & Teplov, 2018) have
 95 proposed specific competence profiles, for open innovation teams revealing what
 96 are the main tasks they perform, the main challenges they face and the underlying
 97 competencies behind them. Chatenier, Verstegen, Biemans, Mulder, & Omta
 98 (2010) pointed out that competence profiles are instrumental for the creation
 99 and development of innovation teams. However, besides their comprehensive and
 100 detailed model they also suggest that a single competence profile falls short when
 101 it comes to assembling effective innovation teams, specifically at the moment of
 102 determining which competences need to be held by each team member and for
 103 which role.

104 Despite the existing research, the literature remains scarce when referring
 105 to what competences are key for guiding the conformation of SI lab teams
 106 and under which roles can they be organized. This is a major issue for the
 107 successful implementation of an innovation lab initiative, since beyond physical
 108 and technological resources, human facilitation is one of its fundamental pillars
 109 (Magadley & Birdi, 2009). Furthermore, how these aspects are early weighed
 110 in terms of the lab setup and its context (i.e. private, community or university)
 111 determines the type of challenges a lab team will have to face (Rayna & Striukova,
 112 2019). But more importantly, the strategies to overcome these challenges could

113 be driven or undermined according to the competences of the lab team, reflecting
 114 also on how effectively they would be able to achieve the intended social impact
 115 (Rayna & Striukova, 2021). Therefore, the main focus of this article lies on the
 116 identification of the key competences and roles that could help the conformation
 117 of teams meant to be the bearers of SI processes. Our goal is to propose a
 118 methodological approach for the early design of SI lab teams. By means of a
 119 self-assessment tool, we intend to provide practical guidance for the creation of
 120 more enduring lab teams while at the same time we continue to create awareness
 121 on the management of these organizational structures.

122 To this end, the article first elaborates on the concepts of SI lab, competence
 123 and innovation roles. Next, a role-based framework is developed by comparing
 124 seven existing conceptual frameworks drawn from the literature on innovation
 125 teams and SI. Then, the proposed framework is operationalized through a
 126 competence-based assessment tool (online questionnaire) from which a self-
 127 assessment methodology is designed. This approach is subsequently tested
 128 within the context of the Climate Labs project, an Erasmus+ initiative whose
 129 aim is to strengthen the applied research and innovation capacities of 10 Latin
 130 American Higher Education Institutions in Mexico, Brazil and Colombia via
 131 the design and implementation of Social Innovation Labs for mitigation and
 132 adaptation to Climate Change. Results from this exploratory study evidence
 133 that the chosen approach is instrumental in the characterization of teams at
 134 the early stages of the implementation of a lab project inside Higher Education
 135 Institutions, enabling them to elicit improvement strategies. Lastly, discussion
 136 and conclusions are built around the main implications of this work and suggested
 137 paths for future research.

138 2. Theoretical Background

139 2.1. Social Innovation Labs

140 SI refers to the new answers provided to the increasing unsatisfied or badly-
 141 satisfied societal issues (Gregoire, 2016). It is understood as the new social
 142 relations (doing, organizing, framing and knowing) between people (e.g. producers
 143 and consumers, citizens and government, refugees and native inhabitants, etc.)
 144 as well as between people and any other aspect in society (e.g. people and
 145 nature, producers and their products, etc.) (Strasser, Kraker, & Kemp, 2019).
 146 SI has been described as being context specific, these new social relations often
 147 lead to novel practices that are meant to address social issues such as childcare,
 148 education, unemployment, crime prevention, ageing population or climate change
 149 (Dias & Partidário, 2019 ; Rayna & Striukova, 2019). This means that the value
 150 sought through SI is primarily intended to benefit society rather than individuals
 151 (Moulaert2014?). A key difference from other innovation approaches, such as
 152 technological innovation, is that the focus is not necessarily on new technologies
 153 or material infrastructure but to contribute to solving social problems where
 154 technology is seen as a means for that purpose (Mulgan, 2006; Murray, Caulier-
 155 Grice, & Mulgan, 2010). In that sense, SI mainly consists of taking advantage of

existing competences and expertise within the population to find more effective, efficient or sustainable ways to tackle current demanding issues (Strasser, Kraker, & Kemp, 2019). This also implies that SI solutions are a product of relational changes that prioritize values rather than status, purpose rather than profit, co-ownership rather than hierarchy, and collaboration rather than competition (Gregoire, 2016; Strasser, Kraker, & Kemp, 2019).

Recently, the term SI lab has been used for framing the different organizational forms that agglomerate teams and methods with the intention of creating socially innovative initiatives (Jezierski et al., 2014; Wascher, Kaletka, & Schultze, 2019; Westley et al., 2015). The notion of innovation labs has been present in the literature for several years now (Osorio2019a?), building on the more classic “lab” idea usually associated to the physical or natural sciences, to establishing itself as a “safe haven for experimentation, focused on problem solving and solution creation” (Bloom & Faulkner, 2016). Among the constellation of labs, SI labs raise with the particular focus on addressing complex social problems and enabling coherent action by multiple stakeholders (Zikovic2018?). They do so by providing the space and processes for facilitating collaboration among cross-sector stakeholders in order to develop new projects, products, tools, regulations, policies, etc. (Wascher, Hebel, Schrot, & Schultze, 2018).

SI labs are characterized because they foster the creation of dialogue, listening and mixing the different voices of the actors involved, and creating boundary objects (e.g. prototypes, illustrations, concepts, scenarios, and maps) for knowledge co-production processes to allow diverse actors to work together (Lake, Fernando, & Eardley, 2016; See Nilsson, Bonnici, & EL, 2015; Timmermans, Blok, Braun, Wesselink, & Nielsen, 2020). Ultimately, they act as cross-pollinators of co-creation methods, approaches and perspectives between groups allowing to stimulate and channel collective creativity so that new ideas constantly emerge (Jezierski et al., 2014; Rayna & Striukova, 2019). Despite how promising it is to pursue the innovation lab approach, it is important to keep in mind that this is a response to keep up to increasing and accumulating changes that we live today and where more conventional approaches fall short (Zivkovic, 2018; RezaeeVessal2021?). That is to say, to embark on such an initiative implies to deal with uncertainty, ambiguity and tensions that are inherent aspects of working on such complex and changing conditions (Jezierski et al., 2014; Ferney Osorio et al., 2019). This is why organizations willing to create their own “lab” need to be aware of the challenges and opportunities that this type of initiative entails.

SI lab teams perform in permeable and changing environments where people and organizations come and go depending on the problem that is being addressed and the parties to whom it is relevant (Wascher, Hebel, Schrot, & Schultze, 2018). These ever-changing conditions demand for teams who value and practice flexibility and agility in order to make the most of the ecosystem. Lab teams should possess a wide range of competences that allow them to be open to transitions and comfortable with ambiguities; use multiple lenses to integrate multiple perspectives; and be able and willing to work across-disciplines so resources can be mobilized in creative ways (Jezierski et al., 2014; Rayna &

202 [Striukova, 2021](#); [Puttick2014teams?](#)). Still, literature seems to remain scarce
 203 when it comes to providing guidance on which competences should SI lab teams
 204 have or focus their development in order to succeed. In the next subsection,
 205 we explore this issue in order to establish a common ground for what set of
 206 competences a team for a SI lab should have.

207 *2.2. Competence and social innovation labs*

208 From organizational and managerial perspectives, development of human
 209 competences is a fundamental task in the path of innovation and successful
 210 organizations ([Leonard-Barton1995?](#)). Understanding individual competences
 211 is key for enabling teams and organizations to perform and adapt in rapidly
 212 changing conditions ([Sandberg, 2000](#)). In general, the concept of *competence* is
 213 understood as the capability of an individual to deliver sustainable and effective
 214 performance in a specific domain, job, role, organizational context or situation
 215 ([Mulder, 2014](#)). A *competence* consists of various *competencies* that coherently
 216 cluster a set of knowledge, skills, attitudes and experience ([Mulder, 2014](#)). In
 217 that sense, competence profiles are often used to represent the functional and
 218 behavioral competencies that are required to successfully meet complex demands
 219 in a particular context ([Chatenier, Verstegen, Biemans, Mulder, & Omta, 2010](#)).

220 In the context of open innovation for instance, ([Chatenier, Verstegen, Biemans,](#)
 221 [Mulder, & Omta, 2010](#)) proposed in their work a competence profile for open
 222 innovation teams based on 20 semi-structured interviews and 2 focus groups with
 223 professionals that had participated in open innovation projects in the agribusiness
 224 sector. Based on their empirical findings, they built a profile composed of 4 main
 225 competence categories and 34 key competencies to accomplish three main tasks
 226 of an open innovation team: (1) managing the inter-organizational collaboration
 227 process, (2) managing the overall innovation process and (3) creating new
 228 knowledge collaboratively. They consider that a team having competence in
 229 self-management, interpersonal management, project management and content
 230 management should be better prepared to deal with the challenges behind those
 231 main tasks.

232 In a similar way, [Podmetina, Hafkesbrink, Teplov, Dabrowska, & Petraite](#)
 233 [\(2015\)](#) proposed an open innovation specialist profile based on a large-scale
 234 survey with 528 European companies. By inquiring on the required and desired
 235 competencies that an employee should have for implementing open innovation,
 236 they build a profile composed of six categories of competencies: collaboration
 237 skills, interdisciplinary skills, methodic skills, explorative skills, transformational
 238 skills and exploitative skills. This work will subsequently lead to the proposition
 239 of a competence model for open innovation in which direct links between com-
 240 petencies, key activities and roles are made at the organizational level ([Podmetina,](#)
 241 [Soderquist, Petraite, & Teplov, 2018](#)). This holistic understanding of what
 242 constitutes a person's essentials elements for performing in a determined task
 243 or role is instrumental for assembling teams and training professionals ([Mulder,](#)
 244 [2014](#)). Furthermore, a competence profile can also be used as an assessment tool
 245 of ongoing teams in order to spark reflecting processes ([Sandberg, 2000](#)). This
 246 ultimately allows managers for identifying whether there is room for improvement

247 and deciding what kind of actions are worth pursuing in order to enhance a
 248 team’s performance, especially in the complex and uncertain circumstances such
 249 as the ones of facilitating innovation processes ([Chatenier, Verstegen, Biemans,](#)
 250 [Mulder, & Omta, 2010](#)). Nevertheless, although the studies conducted by ([Chate-](#)
 251 [nier, Verstegen, Biemans, Mulder, & Omta, 2010](#)) and ([Podmetina, Soderquist,](#)
 252 [Petraite, & Teplov, 2018](#)) are presented as specific but not unique to the open
 253 innovation context, little has been studied in terms of SI and SI labs.

254 While the existing literature on SI labs constantly highlights the importance
 255 of the lab team and the selection of the staff, most of today’s experiences and
 256 insights rely on generic statements such as the need of people with mixed profiles
 257 and backgrounds to reflect the social reality, with both traditional skills such
 258 as project management and communications and innovation skills to get things
 259 done, or with networking skills to gather participants and build connections
 260 ([Jezierski2015?](#)). Acknowledging the importance of this issue, [Wascher, Hebel,](#)
 261 [Schrot, & Schultze \(2018\)](#) gathered from the literature a set of 14 competences
 262 which they proposed as key for a SI lab team (see Table 1). They consider that
 263 the combination of all of these competences should help the team to successfully
 264 manage and facilitate cross-sector collaborations. Furthermore, these teams
 265 tend to be relatively small, usually composed by a lab manager, administrative
 266 staff and members dedicated to the lab-process facilitation ([Wascher, Hebel,](#)
 267 [Schrot, & Schultze, 2018](#)). Yet, there is no evidence that suggests what are
 268 the required roles for a SI lab and further, which competences are needed to
 269 effectively perform those roles.

Table 1: SI Lab list of competences retrieved from [[@Wascher2018](#)]

| Competence | Description |
|--------------------|--|
| Project management | Competence in planning and implementing innovative projects; meeting legal requirements as well as financial expertise, contracts and agreements on the use of space |
| Moderation | Competence for integrating emerging ideas and orient projects |
| Mediation | Competence for helping project parties understand and focus on the important issues needed to reach a conflict resolution |
| Networking | Competence for building connections and relationships with local organizations |
| Participation | Competence in fostering mechanisms for the involvement of the parties in the project’s decision-making processes |
| Communication | Competence for empathy, change of perspective and use of media in a clear, positive, conversational fashion |
| Self-organization | Competence for ambiguity and frustration tolerance, confidence and self-esteem |
| Intercultural | Competence in ensuring inclusivity throughout the project |

| Competence | Description |
|--|---|
| Evaluation | Competence in the design of mechanisms for monitoring strategies and results |
| Research methods and interdisciplinary work | Competence for working under interdisciplinary environments using diverse research methods such as critical thinking, data analytics, social research, anthropology, etc. |
| Design methods and creative thinking | Competence in applying design methods such as design thinking, theory of change planning, etc. |
| Information and telecommunication techniques | Competence in technological techniques that provide support to the project development |
| Entrepreneurial thinking | Competence in project incubation processes and ventures |
| Systems thinking | Competence in addressing challenges in a holistic way and being able to examine the links and interactions between all the constituent elements |

2.3. Innovation Teams & Roles

The idea of thinking on what are the roles or behaviors that are required to facilitate the innovation process within an organization is not new at all. One can refer to the notion of “champion” back in the 60’s where the success of the innovation process was attributed to the one single person who was willing to fail for a doubtful idea but capable of reaching success [Jenssen & Jørgensen \(2004\)](#). Nevertheless, the aim of reflecting on innovation roles is no longer to create heroes that prevail against all odds. Instead, it consists of building strong teams aware of their strengths and weaknesses so that they can find ways to overcome the barriers in the path of realizing the intended innovation process ([Gemeinden2007?](#)). Indeed, innovation does not originate and sustain itself, but rather through the people who make it happen through teams that push their imagination, resilience and perseverance ([Kelley & Littman, 2005](#)).

It is in this sense that literature on innovation teams and roles has evolved, as innovation processes have become more open, collaborative and social, so it has been the case for the roles needed to facilitate these processes. By diving into the literature of innovation teams we intend to illustrate the diversity of roles that members of an innovation team can have which subsequently could be of inspiration for the set up of a lab team. Under this context, seven models of innovation roles have been found in the literature (Figure 1) which will be now discussed.

One of the earliest innovation role models that can be found is the one proposed by ([Roberts & Fusfeld, 1982](#)). Their proposition is composed of five roles needed to fulfil the critical functions for a technology-based innovation process. These are the *idea generator*, the *entrepreneur* or *champion*, the *project leader*, the *gatekeeper* and the *coach*. The intention was to highlight those key functions that were not always explicit in formal job structures. They also

acknowledge that depending on the size of the team or the organization, some roles need to be fulfilled by more than one person, while some individuals can perform more than one role, and that ultimately, the roles someone can fulfil will change over a person’s career. But beyond considering a role as purely functional, it is even more important to ask how a person is going to behave within a team. Under the premise that people’s useful behaviors can be grouped into a set of related clusters, (Belbin, 2010) condensed in her book (originally published in 1993) the nine team roles which make an effective contribution to team performance: *plant, resource investigator, coordinator, shaper, monitor evaluator, teamworker, implementer, completer finisher and specialist*. Even though the Belbin team roles are not exclusively for an innovation team, they represent an important part of team theory that should be considered.

More recently, Hering & Phillips (2005) presented eight innovation roles making emphasis on those that are required for a generic innovation process. They detailed the features of what can be expected of these roles rather than just titles or job descriptions. According to them, *connector, librarian, framer, judge, prototyper, monitor* and *__storyteller__* are the roles that should be sought to set-up an innovation team. Organization’s commitment and a belief system are also considered critical for them in order to have the time and the resources for innovation teams to deal with the uncertainty involved in any innovation process. Alternatively, Kelley & Littman (2005) published their book *Ten Faces of Innovation* based on their experiences at IDEO. They condensed ten persona descriptions as a way to inspire the roles that members of an organization should play to foster creativity and innovation. They consider that each role or persona helps to bring on the table specific values, tools, skills and thus, it is important to assure their presence in any innovation team. These ten roles are grouped in *learners* (anthropologist, experimenter and cross-pollinator), *organizers* (hurdler, collaborator and director) and *builders* (experience architect, set designer, caregiver and storyteller).

Based on 104 interviews with representatives of German enterprises and 42 cases from questionnaires, (Gemünden2007?) proposed a model to assess whether the influence of certain innovation roles increase the success of new product development under increasingly more open innovation contexts. They pointed out that not only innovation and technological experts are present (*expert promoter* and *process promoter*), but strong leadership (*project leader*) as well as good external relationships (*technology and market relationships promoters*). Moreover, they emphasized the importance of having institutional support in the form of *power promoters*. In more recent years, (Goduscheit, 2014) builds on the work initiated by (Gemünden2007?). In this case, he seeks to further develop the concept of innovation promoters. This notion is established on the basis that innovation teams are meant to overcome the barriers and difficulties to successful innovations. His interest was to explore the inter-organizational dimension among the innovation roles proposed by (Gemünden2007?) by analyzing how they interact/perform with multiple organizations. As a result, he further develops the innovation promoters model by moving from the original six roles to a proposition of nine roles: *seniority, top-level representative, technological expert,*

343 *methodology expert, intra-organizational process, inter-organizational process,*
344 *project process, technology relationship and market relationship.*

345 Finally, we refer to the very interesting work conducted by (Nystrom2014?).
346 They also build on the work realized by (Gemünden2007?) on analyzing the
347 roles for an open innovation context but they center their research on the
348 influence these roles can have on innovation networks. For this, they studied
349 26 living labs leading to a final proposition of 17 roles that network actors
350 can adopt or create during an innovation project. The new roles identified are
351 mostly related to the users and the facilitators (*e.g., co-creator, orchestrator,*
352 *contributor*), which correspond to living lab approaches that encourage multi-
353 stakeholder involvement. They also state the importance of innovation roles to
354 combine multiple perspectives due to the increasing complexity of innovation
355 projects. This is something that relates to the more systemic and transdisciplinary
356 approach that is required on SI projects.

357 Throughout this literature review it is possible to observe that despite the
358 diversity of perspectives, processes or names, authors agree that unbalanced
359 teams and frequent changes can disturb how an innovation team performs. This
360 is a challenge that definitely should be considered in the conformation of an
361 innovation lab. However, none of the role models establishes a direct link between
362 the proposed roles and the adequate competences that should allow a person
363 to fulfil it. Nor any of the identified studies is developed under the SI context.
364 These elements are taking into account the proposition of this article in the next
365 section.

366 3. Methodology

367 Throughout the theoretical background presented before, the principles
368 behind the notion of SI labs have been explored, along with the dynamics that
369 lab teams are deemed to deal in such kind of context. Several questions have
370 been raised in terms on which roles would allow a SI lab team to be better
371 prepared to accomplish their mission. And further, what set of competences
372 would be necessary for these teams to thrive in such conditions. Accordingly,
373 seven innovation role models have been retrieved from the literature on innovation
374 teams as well as a set of 14 competences considered as key for SI lab teams.
375 However, since research on how managerial teams of innovation labs perform,
376 and more specifically those within the SI context remains unexplored, through
377 this study we intend to establish a connection between theory from competences
378 for innovation and innovation teams in order to hypothesize on the essentials
379 elements that should be considered in the process of assembling a SI lab team.
380 To this end, a four-stage process was designed for conducting this research as
381 shown in Figure 2.

382 Firstly, based on the literature review an adapted role model is proposed.
383 Since none of the previous role models for innovation teams were rooted in SI nor
384 innovation labs, we aim to take into consideration the 14 identified competences
385 to make a model proposition adapted to the conditions of this research. Following
386 this, the proposed model is operationally defined as an assessment tool (online

questionnaire) that would ultimately be applied under a self-assessment approach. Given the practical motivation behind this exploratory study, is to support 10 latin-american university teams to set up the lab team for their own SI lab within the frame of the Erasmus+ Climate Labs project, we opted to pursue a self-assessment approach with a two-fold purpose. Firstly, to use the proposed approach to spark reflecting processes that would allow the university teams to increase awareness of their current status toward the expected roles. And secondly, to have a comprehensive role characterization at the early stage of the project encompassing all the lab teams according to their own perception of the degree of mastery of such competences.

Due to the transcontinental nature of the Climate Labs project, the application of the self-assessment approach was conducted virtually by means of the online questionnaire and an online workshop. The proposed approach was designed so each lab team member (including professors, researchers, students, and administrative staff) could participate and be part of the process. A total of 65 answers were received along with the workshop results for each team. Results and insights are then analyzed and discussed so conclusions can be made in order to provide guidelines for the future of the Climate Labs project but also to the further development of this study.

4. Proposition of a competence-based role model for SI Lab teams

Despite several insights from empirical studies and different statements of which functions or behaviours are possible to find in an innovation team, the propositions and explanations fall short when it comes to the specificity of innovation lab teams. We therefore believe that it is reasonable to think that by establishing a clearer connection between competences for SI labs and innovation team theory a model can be proposed. First, drawing from the 14 competences proposed by (Wascher, Hebel, Schrot, & Schultze, 2018), a categorization was made thinking on which main functions could be proposed. Based on the literature and according to knowledge and experience of the authors, four categories of competences were identified as illustrated in Table 2. This was done in terms of those competences that contribute the most to one of the following functions: (1) innovation process orchestration, (2) materialize systemic solutions, (3) spark connections and new ideas, and those that contribute to (4) organizing and measuring results.

Table 2: Categorization of SI lab team competences

| Competence | Orchestrate Innovation Process | Materialize Systemic Solutions | Spark Connections & Ideas | Organize and measure results |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Project management | | | | X |
| Moderation | X | | | |

| Competence | Orchestrate Innovation Process | Materialize Systemic Solutions | Spark Connections & Ideas | Organize and measure results |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Mediation | X | | | |
| Networking | | | X | |
| Participation | X | | | |
| Communication | | | X | |
| Self-organization | | | | X |
| Intercultural | X | | | |
| Evaluation | | | | X |
| Research methods and interdisciplinary work | | X | | |
| Design methods and creative thinking | | X | | |
| Information and telecommunication techniques | | X | | |
| Entrepreneurial thinking | | | X | |
| Systems thinking | | X | | |

- 421 Belbin, R. M. (2010). *Team roles at work, second edition. Team Roles at*
422 *Work, Second Edition* (Second., pp. 1–162). Taylor; Francis. Retrieved from
423 www.belbin.com
- 424 Bloom, L., & Faulkner, R. (2016). Innovation spaces: Lessons from the united
425 nations. *Third World Quarterly*, 37, 1371–1387. Routledge. Retrieved from
426 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01436597.2015.1135730>
- 427 Camargo, M., Morel, L., & Lhoste, P. (2021). *Progressive university technol-*
428 *ogy transfer of innovation capabilities to SMEs: An active and modular*
429 *educational partnership.* (D. Mietzner & C. Schultz, Eds.) *New Perspec-*
430 *tives in Technology Transfer. FGF Studies in Small Business and En-*
431 *trepreneurship.* (1st ed., pp. 181–205). Springer, Cham. Retrieved from
432 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61477-5_11
- 433 Chatenier, E. du, Verstegen, J. A. A. M., Biemans, H. J. A., Mulder, M., & Omta,
434 O. S. W. F. (2010). Identification of competencies for professionals in open in-
435 novation teams. *R and D Management*, 40, 271–280. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
436 Retrieved from [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-9310.](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2010.00590.x)
437 [2010.00590.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2010.00590.x)
438 [2010.00590.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2010.00590.x)
439 [2010.00590.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2010.00590.x)

- DeCusatis, C. (2008). Creating, growing and sustaining efficient innovation teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 17, 155–164. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2008.00478.x>
- Delgado, L., Galvez, D., Hassan, A., Palominos, P., & Morel, L. (2020). Innovation spaces in universities: Support for collaborative learning. *Journal of Innovation Economics & Management*, 31, 123–153. De Boeck Supérieur. Retrieved from <https://www.cairn.info/revue-journal-of-innovation-economics-2020-1-page-123.htm>
- Dias, J., & Partidário, M. (2019). Mind the gap: The potential transformative capacity of social innovation. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11, 1–17.
- Goduscheit, R. C. (2014). Innovation promoters - a multiple case study. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43, 525–534. Elsevier Inc.
- Gregoire, M. (2016). Exploring various approaches of social innovation: A francophone literature review and a proposal of innovation typology. *RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 17, 45–71. Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie. Retrieved from http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1678-69712016000600045&lng=en&tlng=en
- Gryszkiewicz, L., Lykourantzou, I., & Toivonen, T. (2016). Innovation labs: Leveraging openness for radical innovation? *Journal of Innovation Management*, 4, 68–97. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2556692
- Hering, D., & Phillips, J. (2005, November). Innovation roles the people you need for successful innovation. NetCentrics Corporation.
- Jenssen, J. I., & Jørgensen, G. (2004). How do corporate champions promote innovations? *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 08, 63–86. World Scientific Pub Co Pte Lt. Retrieved from <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/epdf/10.1142/S1363919604000964>
- Jeziarski, E., Harvey, J., Hansen, L., Takeuchi, M., Sinha, R., Kieboom, K. M. M., & Edwards, D. (2014). *Labcraft: How social labs cultivate change through innovation and collaboration* (p. 160). Labcraft Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.kl.nl/en/publications/labcraft-innovation-labs-cultivate-change/>
- Kelley, T., & Littman, J. (2005). *The ten faces of innovation : IDEO's strategies for beating the devil's advocate & driving creativity throughout your organization* (pp. 1–273). Currency/Doubleday.
- Kieboom, M., Exel, T. van, & Sigaloff, C. (2015). *Lab practice: Creating spaces for social change* (pp. 1–81). Kennisland. Retrieved from <https://www.kl.nl/en/publications/lab-practice-creating-spaces-for-social-change/>
- Kratzer, J., Leenders, O. T. A. J., & Engelen, J. M. L. van. (2004). Stimulating the potential: Creative performance and communication in innovation teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 13, 63–71. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2004.00294.x>
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2004.00294.x>
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2004.00294.x>

- 485 Lake, D., Fernando, H., & Eardley, D. (2016). The social lab classroom: Wrestling
486 with—and learning from—sustainability challenges. *Sustainability: Science,*
487 *Practice, and Policy*, 12, 76–87. ProQuest. Retrieved from [http://sspp.](http://sspp.proquest.com)
488 [proquest.com](http://sspp.proquest.com)
- 489 Lewis, J. M. (2020). The limits of policy labs: Characteristics, opportunities
490 and constraints. *Policy Design and Practice*, 1–10. Routledge. Retrieved
491 from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25741292.2020.1859077>
- 492 Lewis, M., & Moultrie, J. (2005). The organizational innovation laboratory.
493 *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14, 73–83. Retrieved from [http:](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2005.00327.x)
494 [/doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2005.00327.x](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2005.00327.x)
- 495 Magadley, W., & Birdi, K. (2009). Innovation labs: An examination into the
496 use of physical spaces to enhance organizational creativity. *Creativity and*
497 *Innovation Management*, 18, 315–325. Retrieved from [http://doi.wiley.com/](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2009.00540.x)
498 [10.1111/j.1467-8691.2009.00540.x](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2009.00540.x)
- 499 McGann, M., Wells, T., & Blomkamp, E. (2019). Innovation labs and co-
500 production in public problem solving. *Public Management Review*, 1–20. Re-
501 trieved from [https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14719037.2019.](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14719037.2019.1699946)
502 [1699946](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14719037.2019.1699946)
- 503 Mulder, M. (2014). *Conceptions of professional competence*. (S. Billett, C.
504 Harteis, & H. Gruber, Eds.) *International Handbook of Research in Profes-*
505 *sional and Practice-based Learning* (pp. 107–137). Springer, Dordrecht.
506 Retrieved from [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-017-8902-](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-017-8902-8_5)
507 [8_5](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-017-8902-8_5)
- 508 Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations: Technology,*
509 *Governance, Globalization*, 1, 145–162. MIT Press - Journals. Retrieved from
510 <https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.2.145>
- 511 Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social*
512 *innovation* (p. 224). National endowment for science, technology; the art
513 London. Retrieved from [https://youngfoundation.org/publications/the-open-](https://youngfoundation.org/publications/the-open-book-of-social-innovation/)
514 [book-of-social-innovation/](https://youngfoundation.org/publications/the-open-book-of-social-innovation/)
- 515 Nilsson, W., Bonnici, F., & EL, E. W. G. (2015). *The social innovation lab: An*
516 *experiment in the pedagogy of institutional work*. *The Business of Social and*
517 *Environmental Innovation: New Frontiers in Africa* (pp. 201–212). Springer
518 International Publishing. Retrieved from [https://link.springer.com/chapter/](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-04051-6_11)
519 [10.1007/978-3-319-04051-6_11](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-04051-6_11)
- 520 Osorio, Ferney, Dupont, L., Camargo, M., Palominos, P., Peña, J. I., & Alfaro,
521 M. (2019). Design and management of innovation laboratories: Toward a
522 performance assessment tool. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 28,
523 82–100. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd (10.1111). Retrieved from [http://doi.wiley.](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/caim.12301)
524 [com/10.1111/caim.12301](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/caim.12301)
- 525 Osorio, Ferney, Dupont, L., Camargo, M., Palominos, P., Peña, J. I., & Alfaro,
526 M. (2019). Design and management of innovation laboratories: Toward a
527 performance assessment tool. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 28,
528 82–100. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd (10.1111). Retrieved from [http://doi.wiley.](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/caim.12301)
529 [com/10.1111/caim.12301](http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/caim.12301)

- Osorio, Ferney;, Dupont, L., Camargo, M., Sandoval, C., & Peña, J. I. (2020). Shaping a public innovation laboratory in bogota: Learning through time, space and stakeholders. *Journal of Innovation Economics & Management*, 31, 69–100. De Boeck Supérieur. Retrieved from <https://www.cairn.info/revue-journal-of-innovation-economics-2020-1-page-69.htm>
- Podmetina, D., Hafkesbrink, J., Teplov, R., Dabrowska, J., & Petraite, M. (2015). What skills and competences are required to implement open innovation? *ISPIM Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1–20). The International Society for Professional Innovation Management (ISPIM). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1780140077/fulltext/11860BF316DB4B68PQ/1?accountid=14211>
- Podmetina, D., Soderquist, K. E., Petraite, M., & Teplov, R. (2018). Developing a competency model for open innovation: From the individual to the organisational level. *Management Decision*. Emerald Group Publishing Ltd. Retrieved from <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/MD-04-2017-0445/full/html>
- Puttick, R., Baek, P., & Colligan, P. (2014). *I-teams: The teams and funds making innovation happen in governments around the world*. Nesta. Retrieved from <https://www.nesta.org.uk/report/i-teams-the-teams-and-funds-making-innovation-happen-in-governments-around-the-world/>
- Rayna, T., & Striukova, L. (2019). Open social innovation dynamics and impact: Exploratory study of a fab lab network. *R and D Management*, 49, 383–395. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/radm.12376>
- Rayna, T., & Striukova, L. (2021). Fostering skills for the 21st century: The role of fab labs and makerspaces. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 164, 120391. Elsevier Inc. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162520312178%20https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0040162520312178>
- Roberts, E. B., & Fufeld, A. R. (1982). *Critical functions: Needed roles in the innovation process*. (R. Kats, Ed.) *Carrer issues in human resource management* (pp. 182–207). Prentice-Hall. Retrieved from https://books.google.fr/books/about/Career_issues_in_human_resource_manageme.html?id=4CYUAQAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Sandberg, J. (2000). Understanding human competence at work: An interpretative approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 9–25. Academy of Management. Retrieved from <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/1556383>
- Strasser, T., Kraker, J. de, & Kemp, R. (2019). Developing the transformative capacity of social innovation through learning: A conceptual framework and research agenda for the roles of network leadership. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11. MDPI AG.
- Timmermans, J., Blok, V., Braun, R., Wesselink, R., & Nielsen, R. Ø. (2020). Social labs as an inclusive methodology to implement and study social change: The case of responsible research and innovation. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 7, 410–426. Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23299460.2020.1787751>

- 576 Wascher, E., Hebel, F., Schrot, K., & Schultze, J. (2018). *Social innovation labs*
577 *- a starting point for social innovation*. TU Dortmund University. Retrieved
578 from [https://kommunen-innovativ.de/sites/default/files/kosi-lab_report_](https://kommunen-innovativ.de/sites/default/files/kosi-lab_report_social_innovation_labs_final.pdf)
579 [social_innovation_labs_final.pdf](https://kommunen-innovativ.de/sites/default/files/kosi-lab_report_social_innovation_labs_final.pdf)
- 580 Wascher, E., Kaletka, C., & Schultze, J. (2019). *Social innovation labs - a seedbed*
581 *for social innovation. Atlas of social innovation: 2nd volume - A world of new*
582 *practices* (pp. 136–138). Retrieved from [https://www.socialinnovationatlas.](https://www.socialinnovationatlas.net/articles/)
583 [net/articles/](https://www.socialinnovationatlas.net/articles/)
- 584 Westley, F., Laban, S., Rose, C., McGowan, K., Robinson, K., Tjornbo, O., &
585 Tovey, M. (2015). *Social innovation lab guide* (p. 110). Waterloo Institute for
586 Social Innovation; Resilience: Waterloo. Retrieved from [https://uwaterloo.ca/](https://uwaterloo.ca/waterloo-institute-for-social-innovation-and-resilience/projects/social-innovation-lab-guide)
587 [waterloo-institute-for-social-innovation-and-resilience/projects/social-innovation-](https://uwaterloo.ca/waterloo-institute-for-social-innovation-and-resilience/projects/social-innovation-lab-guide)
588 [lab-guide](https://uwaterloo.ca/waterloo-institute-for-social-innovation-and-resilience/projects/social-innovation-lab-guide)
- 589 Zivkovic, S. (2018). Systemic innovation labs: A lab for wicked problems. *Social*
590 *Enterprise Journal*, 14, 348–366. Emerald Publishing Limited. Retrieved
591 from <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/10.1108/SEJ-04-2018-0036>