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Abstract

This dissertation seeks to contribute to the framework of open innovation strategy applied to social enterprises. Although developed markets are characterised by the innovation of many of their industries, this not a distinguishing characteristic of many of Latin American economies. Moreover, open innovation and social innovation are subject areas that have been studied in developed countries but under-researched in emerging markets. This study applies an abductive approach, combining the empirical findings of the cases with the phenomenon that is described in the existing literature by connecting them to open social innovation and collaborative projects. Furthermore, the findings allow to derive new themes in the current framework of open social innovation and collaborative projects. The combination of the strategies suggest that social enterprises can generate profit while providing a social good and engaging people in projects where innovation meets a collaborative action for societal change.
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1. Introduction

The central focus is the social enterprises engaged in open innovation and their involvement in collaborative projects. It represents a phenomenon that it has not been studied in the context of open innovation in social enterprises in emerging markets, which make it an interesting empirical study. This work aims to contribute to the existing academic literature.

1.1 Research Context

This study is interested in the phenomenon of social enterprises which apply an open innovation (OI) strategy with regards to the idea and innovation for the organisations, referred to as open social innovation OSI. Subsequently, there is a hybrid of open and user innovation (OUI) because these social enterprises are involved in open, collaborative projects (OCP). Evidence of this phenomenon can be found in Latin America, and their headquarters are in Chile. The phenomenon is elaborated through different cases, which represent the combination of open innovation (OI), social innovation (SI), and open, collaborative projects (OCP). Although academic research has been studied separately, empirical evidence shows that the three fields are interconnected. Therefore, this study suggests having a closer look, at the three topics in order to develop a thorough understanding of the phenomenon (Figure 1).

The lack of support by the government and the institutions in Latin America poses difficulties and multiple challenges for social enterprises to start or sustain an initiative, and to find the right networks for collaboration and fostering social innovation. Global innovativeness index labelled Latin America as the region with “untapped innovation potential” (Dutta Soumitra, 2016). More specifically, In terms of innovation in the region, Chile stands out among the best countries and Brazil, even with considerable economic turbulence and corruption that constrains a sustainable innovation commitment, is emerging. With continuous introduction to new products and services, Chile has moved from efficiency-driven stage to the innovation-driven stage. Moreover, the global competitiveness report mentions the stages of economic development. The ranking in general illustrates that Chile is ranked as first in the Latin-American region, followed by Brazil and Colombia (Abarca and Mandakovic, 2016).
1.2 Research Questions

The empirical study will look at the OSI as a strategy for social enterprises along with the open, collaborative projects they are engage in. Within the existing literature on innovation, OI applied in social enterprises is a new topic, and the focus of social enterprises in emerging markets will provide significant contributions.

This dissertation follows a multiple case study approach of seven social enterprises. These cases are for profit social enterprises and are also engaged in open, collaborative projects. In order, to address the gaps in the literature and provide future knowledge regarding open innovation in social enterprises, the researcher has posed three main research questions, to be answered:

- $Q_1$ How is open social innovation a strategy for social enterprises?
- $Q_2$ How do social enterprises engage in open, collaborative projects?
- $Q_{2.2}$ What are the barriers in open collaborative projects?

1.3 Research Objectives

The aim of this research is to critically evaluate the OSI applied in social enterprises. These explorations drove us to identify the OCP these organisations are involved in. Moreover, the interest is to identify how the social enterprises apply the OSI strategy to the involvement in OCP and the development of it.
1.4 Dissertation Structure

In answering the research questions, the study follows a structure in a coherent and logical manner. Following this introduction (chapter 1), the second chapter reviews the relevant literature for this work and the theoretical framework which contains the academic literature in SI, OI, OSI and OCP. The literature review covers the following topics: 2.1) The Evolution of Innovation 2.2) Social Innovation 2.3) Open innovation 2.4) A contrast of open and social innovation 2.5) Open social innovation 2.5) Research gaps. In chapter 3, the methodology is presented and illustrates the following aspects of the research: 3.1) Research philosophy 3.2) Research approach 3.3) Multiple-case study 3.4) Data analysis 3.5) Ethical considerations.

Chapter 4, represents the empirical findings from the case studies examined especially for the dissertation. The case description follows the purpose and the applied innovation in each case. Chapter five, and six are the pivotal point of the research as it analyses the themes emerging from each interview. The cases are analysed, in themes and aggregate dimension, which lead us to the discussion section, demonstrating the research contributions. Chapter 7, presents the remarks and conclusions and provides further suggestions to the academy.
2. Literature review

The literature review aims to clarify the basic terms in the debate of open and user innovation in social enterprises and explores new forms of innovation among them. It defines the basic meaning of innovation, social innovation and the contrast of open and user innovation applied to social enterprises, confirming the afore-mentioned gap in the existing literature about OSI. It then seeks to clarify the notion of collaboration and pinpoint why, how and under what conditions collaboration enhances open and user innovation in a social context. Finally, it sets out the research goal of this dissertation.

2.1 The evolution of innovation

The generation of an idea is an invention, but converting it into an application such as products and services is innovation (Mulgan and Albury, 2003, cited in Nicholls, 2015). The process of invention involves brainstorming, creativity and the recombination of different elements, but bringing it to market is what makes it an innovation (Gabison and Pesole, 2014). Innovation involves change, ranging from a disruptive new idea to a small modification in the continuous improvement that enhances the quality of a product or service that promotes a social welfare. Innovation is fundamental to economic growth and profitability (Hagedoorn, 1996, cited in Nicholls, 2015), and the study of innovation in corporations began with such important thinkers as Adam Smith, Karl Marx and Joseph Schumpeter (Ziegler, 2010). However, innovation does not only apply to the private sector, it also has an application in the public sector and nonprofit organisations that create social good (Nicholls, 2015). It is central not only for corporations, but also for social mission organisations whose goal is to provide a social good for profit or for nonprofit, and for the public sector. However, compared to the private sector, non-profit organisations and social enterprises often lack the economic resources to have an R&D department.

This research is considering the topic of open innovation rather than closed innovation occurring in an R&D department. According to Schumpeter, corporations produce and innovate only from the inside. Chesbrough (2003), defined open innovation as a strategy to find knowledge used in innovation in the outside world (for example, from customers, suppliers, and independent research institutions such as those found in universities). Von Hippel (1998), has also defined it from the user perspective. Chesbrough (2003) and Von Hippel (1988) have different approaches towards open innovation, which will be described.
2.2 Social innovation

According to Simms (2006), social innovation is as old as humankind because innovation is fundamental for the progress of humanity. There is little agreement on the general concept and process of social innovation in social science (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). According to Phillips et al. (2015, p. 443), social innovation is about "identifying a problem-solving opportunity to meet a social need". However, there is a lack of empirical research about the process of social innovation, with most studies regarding social innovation focusing on the role of the entrepreneur, and the theoretical and conceptual framework concentrates on the networks and systems around the entrepreneur (Phillips et al., 2015). Moreover, the research about social innovation is based on stories and case studies, "lacking unifying paradigms" (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014). Even though the literature about this concept is incongruent among the different fields of studies, it, nevertheless, suggests that social innovation is broadly described as the transformation of society through development of new products and services that create value by being not only profitable but also environmentally friendly and leading to social change.

Studies of social innovation in peer-reviewed journals include, for instance, the phenomenon of microfinance by Nobel Prize winner Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank ((Cajaiba-santana, 2014; Mongelli and Rullani, 2017). According to Phillips et al. (2015), examples of social innovation involve a local community using tools such as microfinance, fair trade or community-centred planning to provide solutions to local needs. Many organisations have discovered the complexity of social and economic problems and understand that it requires sophisticated solutions ((Phills, James A, Deiglmeier Kriss, 2008; Tim Brown & Jocelyn Wyatt, 2010). For that reason, nowadays, there are more partnerships and collaborations among non-profit organisations, social entrepreneurs, private and public sectors.

2.2.1 Stages of social innovation

According to extensive research published by the Young Foundation, the innovation process has six stages (Figure 2). These are: 1) identify the problem and the people willing to help; 2) brainstorming on how to solve the problem; 3) testing the ideas and creating prototypes; 4) the implementation process; 5) scaling and diffusion to promote innovation, and, finally, 6) systematic change which involves the interaction of different actors providing long-term solutions to the societal problems (Young Foundation, 2012). Based on the empirical study, most of the
organisations are in one or two stages, but it is rare to find that one organisation is in all of the stages; it depends on the size, age and financial resources (Westley and Antadze, 2010).

**Figure 2: Stages of social innovation**

![Stages of social innovation](image)

*Source: The Young Foundation (2009)*

2.2.2 Types of collaboration
The actors involved in social innovation are very diverse, including social enterprises, foundations, philanthropists, governments and social entrepreneurs (Murray, *et al.* 2009; Le Ber, *et al.* 2010). For instance, the governments can improve their performance by supporting the communities’ initiatives, by understanding not only the needs but also the innovative ideas that members of a community have towards solving a problem, and by disseminating and sharing knowledge with the society. An example is the Office of Social Innovation and Civic Engagement in the United States and David Cameron’s Big Society initiative in the UK, to stimulate conversation by developing a democratic voice, bringing ideas together to solve their community problems by creating social innovation (Chalmers, 2012).

Many examples suggest that governments, societies, universities and social enterprises can work together to produce solutions to social needs (Murray, *et al.* 2009). Social innovation occurs when an empowered group of people wants to make a change and institutions with power and money allow it by making most of those changes. However, authors suggest that there are still problems with engaging in collaboration and with this model of the mobilization of society towards a collective change (Tencati and Zsolnai, 2009; Chalmers, 2012). Having demonstrated how effective social innovation is, they demonstrate that it is still challenging and suggest a conceptual framework to understand how the process occurs (Cajaiba-Santana, 2014).
The driver of social innovation is the effort to solve societal problems arising from armed conflicts, natural disasters and climate change (Howaldt et al., 2014; Urban and Gaffurini, 2017). Empirical research in social innovation suggests that collaboration is necessary to overcome such challenges because such cooperation and collaboration among different actors can increase the competencies and disperse the risk (Howaldt et al., 2014). In western countries, collaborative innovation has become an important aspect in public and non-profit organisations (Chalmers, 2012). Nowadays, social mission organisations have adopted many models to meet their need to get external knowledge. Nesta, an innovation foundation, mentioned that collaboration is a strategy to foster social innovation (Nicholls, 2015). For this reason, we now turn to a discussion on OI, OSI and various forms of collaborative innovation.

2.3 Open innovation

2.3.1 Open Innovation

According to Chesbrough (2003), “open innovation is a paradigm that assumes that, as firms look to advance their technology, they can and should use external ideas as well as internal ones” (p. 43). Moreover, the definition is the most broadly used among the literature of open innovation. OI is described as a strategy to find external knowledge for innovative ideas that benefit organisations. These happen because organisations do not have all the knowledge needed to innovate and it is hard to get to the masses only with an R&D department. For that reason, organisations need to consider an “inside-out” and “outside-in” strategy where organisations are open to the world under certain conditions (Chesbrough and Crowther, 2006). These are concepts that close the gap between their internal R&D section and what the users or other organisations think about their product.

The OI paradigm is exemplified by many multinational corporations, SMEs and non-technological institutions (Chesbrough and Crowther, 2006; Sharir and Lerner, 2006). Moreover, OI in SMEs is quite different from the large firms. For instance, the innovation in SMEs is driven by the linkages and networks which are linked to the business strategies and the actions (Sharir and Lerner, 2006; Chesbrough, 2014). Also, SMEs prefer to engage in non-financial activities such as networks and building relationship (Chesbrough, 2014). Other examples, include the "tournament-based crowdsourcing" which has helped to solve multiple problems by specifying a problem and inviting everyone to contribute ideas towards the solutions; some of these are in the form of a "request for proposals" (Chesbrough, 2003). Foundations and social enterprises are
using this crowdsourcing model to find solutions that affect them and others in the society. However, there are other examples of OI in social mission organisations and not necessarily only the crowdsourcing model (Wemmer and Koenigstorfer, 2016).

Gassmann and Enkel (2004), consider the coupled process in technological enterprises which combines the inside-out and outside-in process for the development of the innovation. Therefore, they complement each other through alliances and collaboration with different actors, and linking inside-out and outside-in for the success of the organisations and their development. These empirical studies suggest that organisations are integrating external information and bringing ideas to the market for leveraging (Gassmann and Enkel, 2004; Gassmann, et al. 2010). This suggests that firms are selectively open, providing information that it is convenient for their organisations (Dahlander and Gann, 2010). For that reason, OI as defined by Chesbrough is firm centric and satisfies the enterprise rather than being voluntarily open and collaborative for a common purpose.

According to Enkel, Gassmann and Chesbrough (2009), there is a lack of literature, because the existing one has focused on inside-out rather than outside-in and coupled innovation. Moreover, there is abundant literature relating it to high-tech firms, large firms and western firms leading to the lack of literature in the SMEs and emerging markets. Ahn, et al. (2013) mentioned that OI is a topic under-researched, the empirical research suggests that OI benefits the financial performance of the organisations.

2.3.2 User Innovation

In contrast to the OI defined above, user-led innovation is an approach that comes from a need to develop a product that is not in the market. Individuals are producing and innovating new products and services rather than expecting others to produce them (Von Hippel, 1988). Von Hippel (2005) suggested that it is also a product for everyone and the market in general; there are no reasons to make it private; that it is a public good that everyone could get an advantage from. Later, he suggested that even if it is called open innovation, it can also be a strategy to benefit the firms only rather than sharing it with others (Von Hippel, 2005). In this case, users are empowered to self-manufacture the products and services that satisfy their needs. The users might be individuals or communities that engage in innovating together and share their creations.
A large body of empirical studies suggests that many users are the innovators of an existing product (Baldwin and von Hippel, 2011). Von Hippel (2005) has also introduced the concept of led users, the users who are able to provide firms ideas for discovering or redefining a product because they experience a need before it is shared with the public. Once innovation yields the solution to their needs, it could also have a greater impact on others. Moreover, research suggests that these lead users engage in knowledge sharing and co-development of other user communities (Von Hippel and Von Krogh, 2003). The led user communities can involve manufacturers, users and members that innovate and invite others who have the same interest to collaborate and work voluntarily for the development of the product or service (Von Hippel, 2005). Due to collaboration, these innovations can diffuse more rapidly and save costs compared to innovations developed by single individuals (Baldwin and von Hippel, 2011; Knoke, et al. 2015).

This realization has led to the discussion of open collaborative innovation – projects where several people collaborate for the welfare of themselves and of others (Baldwin and von Hippel, 2011) (Knoke, et al. 2015). The empirical studies in user led innovation are mostly in the tech industry and the innovation of new products and it has not been studied in the context of social enterprise. There is a phenomenon of open-source software showing that users freely reveal and share their innovation offering to the society a service without financial benefits (Von Hippel and Von Krogh, 2003). There are great examples such as Linux and Apache server software which were created through collective action to produce a service that is free and available for everyone.

2.3.3 Open and User innovation
The differences between open innovation (OI) and user-led innovation (UI) are that one focuses on the business and for profit approach and the other deals with the desire of the person to solve a problem that affects him personally or a group of people – a desire that may be realized in an altruistic manner. For example, OI uses internal and external innovation for the betterment of a product or service and UI focuses on solving a problem without mentioning the privacy of the product and the legal effects. One main difference is the use of IP addressed in the equation. In some cases, the two approaches overlap because innovation is on one hand useful and affects everyone, but on the other hand, one makes innovation a more public rather than private strategy. Von Hippel, (2005) approach uses led-user communities where people are empowered, engage in a cooperative process and collaborate which in turn creates solutions that benefit them.
UI mentions “sticky” information as identifying something that is not available in the market (Von Hippel, 2005). Led user method is a systematic approach to collaborate with users in different industries and engage in collaboration for a problem-solving process (Von Hippel, 2005). Other platforms to innovate are user communities’ platforms which mean “collaboration with a user community, and that collaboration continues after the formation of the new organisational entity”(von Hippel, 2016).

There are differences and similarities between open and user innovation. OI serves the organisations and uses the external environment to leverage the knowledge needed to innovate in products and services. Moreover, whereas OI is a strategy to scale up and innovate faster, UI uses the external knowledge and information to solve the user needs, and in some cases, shares it with the public. A hybrid of these theories can provide insightful information on new forms of thinking and working together towards innovation.

Table 1: Open and User Innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Open Innovation</th>
<th>User and Free Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal study</td>
<td>Multinationals, SMEs in low and high-tech industries</td>
<td>Individual user, user led communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key principles</td>
<td>External knowledge can be used for the innovation process and sustainability of the business model</td>
<td>Enable to solve the needs of individuals and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices to share with others</td>
<td>Copyrights, licensing, patents</td>
<td>Free revealing, sharing, open sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The innovation process</td>
<td>Focus on the firm and become more efficient.</td>
<td>A common purpose to solve their own problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other streams of related research</td>
<td>Focus on the firm</td>
<td>User led or collective model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliances, partnerships</td>
<td>Listens to the customer needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chesbrough, Von Hippel

Table 1 shows a contrast between both perspectives, and this can lead us to the focus on open innovation applied to social enterprises. The researcher has been unable to find literature which enables us to define a hybrid open and user innovation applied in social enterprises. However, Chalmers (2012) and Chesbrough and Di Minin (2014) have mentioned a hybrid of open and social innovation; these two studies allow us to narrow down the area of study further.
2.4 Open and Social innovation

In both cases, open and social innovation highlights the importance of collaboration and use of external resources to leverage and scale the resources available in the organisations. Von Hippel, (2005); Murray, Caulier-Grice and Mulgan, (2009); Chesbrough, et al. (2014) extensively mention the collaborative pattern and the benefits that it could bring to organisations if they are engaged in more collaboration. This pattern is mentioned in the three approaches. There is also a key factor in terms of each one’s focus: one focuses on the firm, the second on the users that innovate and the third on bringing forth good for others. Their focus is different but all of them try to find ways to innovate and create a sustainable business model (Soto-acosta and Cismaru, 2016). However, there are some cases where user and social innovation are both engaged in bringing products and services for everyone without expecting anything in return. Von Hippel (2005) mentions that innovation should be accessible to everyone, without any constraints. He encourages public institutions to apply them towards the empowerment of their citizens and the co-production of services created by those with a social need as it is the case of a study based in Brazil where citizens provide solutions to reduce violence in the communities (Sorensen, cited in Nicholls Alex, 2015). He demonstrates that it is possible to work towards a common goal and provide these benefits to others. This is the reason why open and social innovation combines the best of both approaches for the betterment and social good.

2.4.1 Open Social Innovation

Chalmers (2012) proposes a model of open social innovation (OSI) to engage in a relationship with competitors, universities, and organisations in order to adapt their internal strategies with the external knowledge. According to Gebauer, et al. (2017) and Inigo, et al. (2017) This tool can provide a more sustainable business model and creatively tackle societal problems. As suggested in the studies, “borrowing from technological and commercial innovation paradigm can be successfully appropriated and applied to the process of identifying and scaling up socially innovative opportunities” (Chalmers, 2012, p. 19). It is important for the organisations to work with others and engage in more collaboration to overcome the barriers that may appear during the first stages of innovation and growth.

Moreover, these studies highlight the common barriers and suggest considering them instead of only looking at the successful and happy stories of social innovation. Problem complexity,
protectionism, and networks are some of the most common barriers to scale up and provide social innovation (Chalmers, 2012). The study suggests that some social mission organisations are rigid and closed and discard disruptive ideas in tackling social problems. "It is a fallacy in the social sector to assume that firms providing social care, wholeheartedly welcome disruptive innovation" (Chalmers, 2012, p. 22). Another challenge is to find the right networks and partners to collaborate and ensure the success of their endeavours.

Chesbrough and Di Minin (2014) define open social innovation as the “application of either inbound or outbound open innovation strategies, along with innovations in the associated business model of the organisations, to social challenges” (p. 169). OSI is a hybrid of the two concepts and provides a clearer approach to the application of open innovation in social mission organisations. The authors present three cases of social mission organisations and give examples on how they are using the outside-in and inside-out approach to leverage, be more sustainable and provide practical solutions to the difficult situations that organisations may face in times of war times or political instability. OI is a key strategy to overcome the barriers that social mission organisations can face, which makes it relevant to the study.

Even though the approach is used as a business model for the organisation in tackling complex problems, it only focuses on general aspects of the organisations, and it does not provide an in-depth analysis. These cases mention diverse types of collaboration among firms, which lead us to more interaction with different stakeholders. In one of their conclusions they suggest that to scale operations it is necessary to engage in diverse types of collaborations because these produce cost savings and a sustainable business model.

OSI is a framework applying OI in social mission organisations. For instance, collaboration is an external factor that is mentioned in both approaches because social enterprises must be cautious on how to spend their resources and become a multiplayer depending on each other. These strategies allow sustaining, scaling and trying new things to meet the needs of the populations that need it the most. Howaldt et al. (2014) suggest that the innovation process is complex and goes through many stages, and in which one idea can proliferate into new ones altering the original one. For that reason, the use of external actors can help in the implementation of the innovation.
Governments are using online platforms to gather opinions and solutions from the local communities (Chalmers, 2012). Some actors in public and private sector are engaging in crowdsourcing. It is a way to empower others and find solutions. For example, OI platforms are those that share information and make it available for those who participate in the challenge (Martins, et al. 2015). At first, everyone is free to upload and propose their innovative ideas and to engage in solving the problem, and others comment and vote on which ideas are the best. However, this type of OI platform is created by a small group of people who are providing a space for collaboration and sharing diverse ideas in the hope of creating solutions and opportunities for engaging in problem solving.

Aside from the latest publication of Chesbrough et al. (2014), related to the OSI framework, the researcher has not found further research that supports this approach. As collaboration is a key aspect for social mission organisations and an important aspect that is common for open, user and social innovation, these have led us to the purpose of the research: to demonstrate that social enterprises are working with different actors and the projects, themselves, are characterised by essential elements of collaboration (Figure 3).

Figure 3 Framework of OSI and OCP

Source: author

2.5 Research Gap
The concept of OI is extensively studied in high-tech, large firms with focus on western countries and in the inbound open innovation process (Hossain et al., 2016). Even though these studies
have provided multiple contributions, they neglect to hybrid Chesbrough and Von Hippel's approach. Piller and West (2014) mention that there is a research gap in the hybrid of both approaches, and encourage future research. Moreover, there is a research gap regarding open social innovation as a strategy for social enterprises. Chalmers (2012) mentions that “there has been a relative lack of academic research exploring the dimensions of open innovation and social innovation” (p. 20). There is limited academic research on open social innovation. However, this study provides an empirical research of open social innovation that focuses on social enterprises and gives an overview of how these enterprises are engaging and tackling problems that affect them and a major community, which implies major stakeholders. There is little or no research on these topic in the Latin American context. It is our premise that it will contribute to the academia and the organisations involved in the research, providing a framework for these organisations and how much more they can contribute towards tackling complex social problems in places where there are weak institutions and infrastructure (Figure 4).

In the light of the research gaps, the following questions raise:

- Q₁ How is open social innovation a strategy for social enterprises?
- Q₂ How do social enterprises engage in open, collaborative projects?
- Q₂.2 What are the barriers to open collaborative projects?

Figure 4: Research Gap

Source: author
3. Research Design

This chapter describes the research methods by, first, explaining the philosophical position and the steps undertaken for the research which will lead us to the research approach, strategy and a detailed overview of the data collection, analysis, limitations and ethical considerations.

3.1 Research philosophy

The first step in describing the research approach is to define the philosophical position, which describes how the researcher creates assumptions and observes the world. The researcher adopts an ontological approach of critical realism as critical realism argue that “what we experience are sensations, the images of the things in the real world, not the things directly” and “how often our senses deceive us” (Saunders, et al. 2012, p. 136). The author suggests that critical realism will only be able to understand social structures based on what we have seen in practice and theory but it is a small fraction of the bigger picture. On the other hand, critical realism allows the importance of multilevel studies that include the “individual, the group, and the organisations” (Saunders, et al. 2012, p. 137).

Based on Bryman and Bell (2011), a paradigm is a cluster of beliefs and dictates the influence, what should be studied, how research should be carried out, and how results should be interpreted. The framework of paradigmatic position in the study is an epistemological interpretivism because it is a very complex reality of social science. In comparison to objects or data, it is far from making “law-like generalization similar to those produce by the physical and natural science” (Saunders, et al. 2012, p. 134). Through this approach, the researcher is well equipped to justify the research approach, strategy and the data collection techniques for the research.
3.2 Research approach

3.2.1 Qualitative approach
This research is qualitative because the researcher relates to studying “things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p. 2). In that sense, this approach allows us to study the complex social settings that founders and co-founders are involved in to better understand how innovation occurs and enhances their capabilities of creating social impact. This research is particularly interested in exploring and conducting semi-structured interviews on how and why social entrepreneurs collaborate with different institutions, rather than describing simply what an interviewee has witnessed.

Open innovation in social enterprises is a recently emerging topic and based on the lack of empirical and theoretical research on the topic, this study is probably one of the first. For that reason, the research strategy is qualitative and adopts an exploratory approach to examine open innovation in social enterprises. An exploratory study allows certain advantages as it is flexible and adapts to the findings that emerge from the data (Saunders, et al. 2012). At the start of the study, we looked only at different types of collaboration, but once the researcher was able to speak with key founders and co-founders and the results of new data and new insights were gained, the researcher was able to change the direction of the research.

3.2.2 Abductive approach
Through the ontological orientation of critical realism and epistemological interpretivism, the research is well-equipped to justify an abductive approach as it is “proposed as a way of overcoming the limitations associated with deductive and inductive positions” (Bryman and Bell, 2011, p. 27). The limitations of inductive reasoning include the generation of theory based on the data, while a limitation of deductive reasoning is that it focuses strictly on theory. An abductive approach allowed us to observe secondary, and primary data and relate it to the general knowledge of a theory (Figure 5). By collecting the data, we explore a phenomenon, identify themes and subsequent themes that lead us to the existing theory and enable us to identify gaps in the literature which are related to the narratives described by the interviews. The abductive approach was a back-and-forth practice of a general knowledge of the theory and the interpretation with the best ability to connect to the existing theory and find research gaps.
3.3 Multiple-case study

The research strategy used to implement an empirical research study is the case study method. Yin, (2003), describes a case study as “exploring a phenomenon within a real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13). For that reason, a case study will be relevant in gaining a rich understanding of the context of the research. Yin (2009), mentions that there are two types of case study methods: mono and multiple case study. This research is a multiple-case study as it allows us to compare the findings and contrast them from each case. Multiple-case studies allow us “to consider what is unique and what is common across cases, and frequently promotes theoretical reflections on the findings” (Bryman and Bell, 2011, p. 71). Given the nature of the research, a multiple-case study approach is chosen because it demonstrates one or two forms of replication and it is suitable for the objectives and questions of the research. This allowed the author to confirm that OI strategy is applied in more than one case in Latin America and it is widely used in the social enterprise sector.

Some critics of case study research argue that it lacks theoretical underpinning and fails to explain anecdotal activities (Conole et al., 2004). The author suggests that case study research lacks academic rigour and creates anecdotes for the reader. Yin, (2003), argues that there is a misunderstanding about case study research and suggest two reasons for this: it is not easy to
carry out or to comprehend and that it can be time-consuming and therefore a difficult task for the researcher.

3.3.1 Sample selection
The sample is compromised in social enterprises that use open innovation and are engaged in open, collaborative projects. Concerning sampling techniques, as the social enterprises and open, collaborative projects in Latin America were unknown to us, the researcher choose a non-probabilistic sampling technique. A non-probabilistic sampling technique provides “a range of alternative techniques to select samples, the majority of which include an element of subjective judgement (Saunders, et al. 2012, p. 281). The technique chosen was the “snowball sampling technique” (Saunders, et al. p. 289). This entails that the initial respondents identify other potential respondents and the subsequent respondents are obtained (Saunders, et al. 2012).

To avoid homogenous relation between the first and subsequent respondents, one of the actions taken is to observe in detail their website and YouTube videos, or a LinkedIn connection that lead us to other sources of information relevant to the research. The initial interviewees were suggested by a regional communication consultant for Avina Foundation, who had the contact of the co-founder of Sistemas B or B corps of the Latin-American region. From there, online interviews were undertaken, and a few social enterprises and cases of open, collaborative, innovative projects in the Latin-American region were suggested.

According to Gioia, et al. (2012), exploratory studies should interview the “experts” on the subject. For that reason, the interviewees were the founders or CEOs for each of the cases. We emailed 17 organisations and received 15 responses. Out of the 15 responses, the researcher was able to interview ten founders or CEOs. Not once did we receive “No” as an answer but five of the first responses did not reply to the second and third email that the researcher sent. All interviews, were carried out over Skype and WhatsApp and lasted between 30 and 60 minutes (Table 2). Although the interviews were only semi-structured interviews, an interview guide was prepared in advance (Appendix 1). All interviews were held in Spanish and transcribed in the original language (Appendix 2); all transcripts were created immediately after the interview to avoid any flow on effects from carrying out multiple interviews (Saunders, et al. 2012). , the researcher (fluent in Spanish and English), to the best of her ability, also translated to English, the most important phrases relevant to the research.
Table 2 List of conducted interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Enterprises</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sistema B</td>
<td>18.5.2017</td>
<td>Co-founder</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fiis</td>
<td>15.6.2017</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Birus</td>
<td>16.6.2017</td>
<td>Co-founder</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Granjero game</td>
<td>23.6.2017</td>
<td>Co-founder</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>54 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CasaCo</td>
<td>19.6.2017</td>
<td>Co-founder</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Broota</td>
<td>7.14.2017</td>
<td>Co-founder CEO</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Emprendiern/Mujeres ON</td>
<td>7.7.2017</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Balloon Latam</td>
<td>29.6.2017</td>
<td>Co-founder</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Social Lab</td>
<td>7.7.2017</td>
<td>Director of I&amp;D</td>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td>23 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Red de almacenes</td>
<td>7.13.2017</td>
<td>Co-founder-CEO</td>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

3.3.2 Data collection

The case study data will rely on interviews and online videos for triangulation. Talks uploaded to the companies' website by each of the founders or co-founders interviewed were considered but the interviews are the main source of the data. The online videos were used for triangulation of the findings and both types of data were used in order to get a better understanding of the organisations’ initiatives. National and local newspapers were also used to help confirm the information given. Moreover, the transcripts of the interviews were sent back to confirm the information and each interviewee also gave us links to the annual progress reports of the organisation. These reports helped confirm the gaps in information and the findings shared by the different social enterprises as to how they have a positive impact on society.

Yin (2003), mentions that “interviews are an essential source of case study information”, primarily because most of the case studies concern human affairs and interviewees allow us to have contact with the complexity of the social science (p. 89). Based on the Gioia approach mentioned earlier, there is flexibility in the way we ask questions rather than following a step-by-step questionnaire which tells us a narrative of what is happening related to the main research questions. A “backtrack” technique was also possible, which meant the researcher could ask questions that arose from speaking with a previous interviewee (Gioia, et al. 2012).
3.4 Data analysis
In order to analyse the data, the research adopted the Gioia qualitative rigor analysis. In that process, the researcher manually coded the phrases of the expert informants to group them. This lead us to “first order concepts, 2nd order themes and the aggregate dimensions” (Gioia, et al. 2012, p. 21). It is also mentioned that this method is widely used and it looks more like a recipe. However, Gioia (2012) encourages the use of the method in different ways to aggregate more value to the research. For that reason, the researcher tried to use each of the most relevant quotes given by the informants that would lead to the second and third level (Appendix 5&6). Out of the ten interviews conducted, 113 phrases that were significant to the research were highlighted and coded. These 113 quotations were then revised and grouped into a 2nd group of relevant themes and aggregate dimension.

3.5 Limitation
There are limitations in the research as all the cases of social enterprises are locate in Chile. The case study research cannot normally have generalised as it is a strategy tested in a seven enterprises and cases. The researcher is observing and using the primary data and online secondary data which can limit the view of what is necessary for the research. Moreover, the author was constrained by a limited time frame for interviewing other social enterprises. In addition, there was a limited word count, and quotes were not included in the findings of the dissertation.

3.6 Ethical Considerations
All emails were sent through the university email account and the aims of the research and the connection from the previous interviewee was explained in them. If the person did not feel comfortable, they were made aware at the beginning of the interview that they could withdraw from the research. All those involved in the research were aware of the research and in case the participants in the research wished to maintain anonymity, then all personal information and transcripts would be kept confidential, and a confidentiality agreement signed. However, this was not the case and information was freely provided to the researcher.
4. Case description

The sample is comprised of seven social enterprises that operate in Santiago, Chile. The interviewee is also engaged in the open, collaborative projects that are mentioned above.

4.1 E3P-Granjero

The social enterprise is a spin-off of Sistema B. In 2014, one of the co-founders was sharing information with a group of students about creating businesses with a social purpose through collaboration. One of the students approached him saying, it was an inspiring talk but that they were born playing Monopoly and are a lost generation. For that reason, three friends created it a game to teach values, promote a systemic vision towards sustainability and more collaboration. The game represented a small world where people needed to talk and share their problems with their neighbours and try to solve them. It was not an easy task to create the game for a diverse group of people and the process to produce it was a fast trial-and-error. Since different approaches were tried to make a final product that could teach collaboration and sustainability, it took almost two years.

There were four diverse actors involved in the idea, implementation and development of the final game; these were Sistemas B, Ludoismo, Idemax and Devir, who is known as the best game publisher in Latin America. In 2014, these actors shared a prototype of the game in the festival of social innovation ‘Fiis’, where they shared it with a large group of potential customers. In that space, they were able to test the final product and receive a lot of feedback about the game. The production of the game was outsourced to a manufacturer in Germany because there were no organisations in Chile that mass-produces wooden pieces for board games. Before the production of the game they also shared their idea through a crowd-funding website where, in less than two days, they reached their goal of $30,000 to begin production. They received requests from New Zealand, UK, the United States and various other Latin-American countries. The board game is available in English and Spanish and, due to the partnership with the publisher, is sold throughout Latin America and Spain. Now the game is also being widely shared in schools, universities and corporations to help spread the message of the new economy more broadly. A second game for children as young as 12 years old is also being produced.

4.2 Socialab

This organisation started in 2012 as a spinoff of “Un Techo para Chile” and is an independent social enterprise and since it proposes social challenges, it has an online platform of open
innovation, for example: finding solutions to obesity or providing access to clean water in rural areas. These challenges are created with the help of other organisations. The challenge can solve social needs and calls out to the community to participate in the challenge. Socialab, in conjunction with two or three organisations in the public and private sector, creates announcement of challenges. Once ideas are in the Socialab platform, it is shared all the innovative ideas in the challenge with the rest of the participants. The best innovative ideas are then financed to turn them into a real project. Socialab then accompanies those that came up with the idea in a of collaborative space where ideas can become a reality. In 2016, more than 30 organisations collaborated to put together challenges involving technology, renewable energy, inclusion, and economic development. In total, sixteen different areas for development were covered. There were fifty-five completed challenges which created 12,407 innovative ideas and more than 476,000 people were involved.

4.3 Redalmacen
The idea was born in 2003, when the co-founders, as the owners of a local store, were faced with the problem of working 14 to 15 hours. As a result, the husband and wife created a control system with modules in stocks and cash that enabled her to have more freedom and not become a slave of paper and pen. Coca-Cola approached them and purchased 300 hundred licenses that were offered to the best local businesses in north of Chile. By then, they thought that it was a “weekend job” and there was no place to go further or do more than that. However, after that experience they had some financial problems which did not allow them to expand to other local businesses. In 2015, they applied to one of the challenges of Socialab and won and with the help of Socialab became an independent social enterprise., Together, they worked in marketing, sales and in restructuring the focus of the social enterprise. Now, the social enterprise has started a collaborative program with municipalities, a foundation and the public sector, educating local business owners about the use of the program and how it can help them to be more efficient in their day-to-day jobs.

4.4 Balloonlatam
This program started in 2011 and in 2016 became a spin-off of Emprediem becoming an independent social enterprise. The three founders met for the first time in Kenya and created a method to empower local entrepreneurs by providing them with the necessary skills to develop their ideas into businesses projects and earn money. It had great results and is expanding in Latin
America and Africa. However, they use different methods, for example, the UK government funds the project in Kenya, in comparison to the project in Latin-America, which is supported by different organisations in the public-private sectors such as universities, social enterprises and local communities.

In Latin America, the project is divided into different stages and takes 2.5 years to complete. The first stage is that local communities apply to the program Balloonlatam, such as Olympic games. Once the location has been chosen, there is an analysis of the threats and opportunities for the local entrepreneurs of the region before a work plan is created at the local level. The second stage occurs when there is collaboration between the different actors in the local area. Afterwards, for five weeks young adults from different parts of the world come and help the local entrepreneurs in the development of their businesses. Lastly, the committee of local innovation helps in the collaboration by strengthening of their local ecosystems. Since 2013, there have been seven Balloon projects, involving 52 companies and with $445,000 invested in the local communities. This program has influenced 91 young adults and 990 entrepreneurs across the seven different sectors.

4.5 Emprediem
Emprediem is a social enterprise that works towards the democratization of entrepreneurship and social innovation. Mujeres on involves public-private organisations, which include the ministry of Women, Entel (a telecommunication company) and emprediem. The purpose is to provide support for women who are the head of their family and produce handcraft and gourmet products. In most cases, these entrepreneurs use recycled raw materials and support is given for the packaging, design, brand development and a business model which allows them to expand their products to a national level. The program was co-created with the two other organisations mentioned above with the aim of helping these women in their approach to selling handcrafted work and gourmet products. It was a collaborative effort with different experts in the different areas. For instance, Emprediem has experience in the commercialization of the product, while the ministry helped with the approach of a program directed to women only and Entel provided the technology to commercialize their products.
4.6 CasaCo
The founders of Startup Chile founded this social enterprise, derived from the Spanish meaning of “the house of collaboration”. Once the founders left Startup Chile, they found that social entrepreneurs felt alone after the first year and that there was no place that invited social entrepreneurs to collaborate, share their ideas and challenges. The purpose of CasaCo is to invite social enterprises that are growing and develop their businesses through collaboration among them. Some activities, such as sharing their challenges and finding others to help them, are some of the practices that allow them to go beyond their own boundaries and think bigger, and to create a more sustainable business model.

4.7 Broota
This social enterprise is an online platform of crowdfunding that helps to generate money through collaboration. It can do so because it is open, with no subscription fee. If you are willing to invest in organisations, you have the freedom to do so and collaborate with social enterprises in need of funding.

4.8 Open collaborative projects
4.8.1 Fiis
Fiis is a festival of international social innovation focused on talking about mass social innovation and a new way of doing business. Founded in 2013 by eight organisations, the number of contributors has increased throughout the years. This event, which is based on the needs of each host country, takes place in 13 cities and is promoted and organised locally throughout Latin America (Chile, Peru, Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay). Fiis is a movement of people and organisations that dream and work day to day for a better world. Through collaboration, they want to generate personal and collective transformation of people towards a society based on respect and understanding.

The project is promoted by social enterprises and non-profit organisations, but is also supported by private and public organizations to make it more extensive and sustainable over the years. The eight organisations do not have an individual agenda but, rather, put the agenda together for the best interest of the organisations. For that reason, collaboration plays a vital role in their meetings. In other locations like Paraguay, the Fiis event is part of an event that already existed in the country. There are countries that have found a good way to organise Fiis; that is to hold it in conjunction with another existing event. Since the inception of the event, there have been
different approaches to make it sustainable in its host city. In each city, it is managed by the local social enterprises that would like to generate the impact, and there is no imposition of an agenda rather, a collaboration of people.

4.8.2 Colusion de Amor
Together with social enterprises in CasaCo, Broota, Balloonlatam and Sistema B, Colusion de Amor created a website to fund and help the communities affected by a fire that had caused a lot of financial loss. The purpose was that each Chilean donate a minimum of seven Chilean pesos and that the money would go to three focuses: to build houses, to support the entrepreneurs affected by the fire and replant the native forest in the affected zones. The website explained the reason for the campaign, and that it would work with voluntary donations. The idea was to donate directly to the three campaigns and attract more volunteers.
5. Findings

This chapter aims to contrast and synthesize the case findings derived from interviews and observations to identify the phenomenon of open social innovation and open collaborative projects which are studied. Moreover, it will finally draw us to the discussion of the OSI framework and their open collaborative projects.

This section reports the results of the ten interviews and the secondary data found through YouTube videos, news and online information available for each of the cases. The combination of the coding results and secondary data allows us to perform a rigorous data analysis (Gioia, 2013). These findings suggest that social enterprises are applying an open innovation model and that they are engaging in open, collaborative projects. The co-founder of Sistema B mentioned, “There is a phenomenon happening in Latin America that is not happening in other parts of the world.” Social enterprises are creating “collaborative projects for the good of everyone in society.” Figure 6 and 7 summarize the themes emerged from the interviews. The themes emerged for OSI strategy are: development of innovation: inside-out, outside-in and coupled process and the different types of collaboration: cross-sectoral collaboration and public-private institutions. Finally, with regards to defining the project, local development, actors involved and barriers, it conduces to OCP.

Figure 6 Themes results of interviews about OSI
5.1 Identifying a social problem and finding innovative ideas

To summarise, the following table 3 & 4 describes the problem, solution, and those who have been benefited by their work. Recognising an opportunity to improve the lives of those involved in local communities and creating an ecosystem of support for other entrepreneurs is the type of roles that these social enterprises are undertaking for the betterment of the world in constant collaboration with public-private organisations, universities, and social enterprises.

Table 3 Identifying the problem and innovative solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E3P-Granjero</td>
<td>There is a lack of material that teaches about social enterprises.</td>
<td>Creation of a board game that promotes collaboration and sustainability</td>
<td>Ludomico, IDEA, Devir y Sistemas B</td>
<td>The game is taught in universities, schools and private organisations to learn about the new economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Collaborators</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CasaCo</td>
<td>No organisation help social entrepreneurs after their first year.</td>
<td>A place where social entrepreneurs collaborate and build a more sustainable business model</td>
<td>Three founders, previous founders of Start Up Chile-a leading accelerator in LATAM</td>
<td>120 social entrepreneurs are involved in the methodology of collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broota</td>
<td>The lack of financial support to start ups and new ventures</td>
<td>A crowdfunding website that invites investors to finance start-ups. It is open to everyone.</td>
<td>Two founders</td>
<td>2458 start-ups were funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emprendimiento</td>
<td>Local entrepreneurs with potential capabilities were alone without any training to evolve their idea to broaden capacities</td>
<td>Provide a program for women as heads of families to produce products that can expand to the national market</td>
<td>Ministry of women, EmpreDiem, and Entel</td>
<td>100 women involved in the program that has provided a higher income and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ballonlatam</td>
<td>Local entrepreneurs in regional areas in Chile lacked support to commercialize their products to national markets.</td>
<td>The creation of a program that involves young professionals to help local entrepreneurs in achieving a better income</td>
<td>Different institutions involved in the local communities</td>
<td>26 communities, 890 local entrepreneurs and income increase 65%. More than 65 young professionals involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Socialab</td>
<td>There was no online platform to create disruptive innovation for society</td>
<td>A platform that uploads challenges and invites the community to solve the societal problems</td>
<td>Different institutions depending on the challenge</td>
<td>12,407 ideas to solve social problems, 206 projects support it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Redalmacen</td>
<td>Local business owners spent 14 to 15 hours daily in their local businesses, and there was no quality of life</td>
<td>A program that helps local store owners to systematize their activities. An application that helps local owners to organise their activities electronically.</td>
<td>The same users affected by the problem created the idea. Socialab help them to create the business model</td>
<td>More than 50 owners have access to use the system and are accompanied by the founders and co-founders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 Open Collaborative Projects: Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Organisers</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiiis</td>
<td>An international festival about social innovation to educate the mass</td>
<td>50 organisations involve in the creation of the project. Amongst them: Socialab, Sistema B, Balloonlatam</td>
<td>An annual event in 13 cities of Latin America sharing and educating about social innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusión de Amor</td>
<td>a website to fund and help the communities affected by the fire that had many financial losses</td>
<td>CasaCo, Broota, Balloonlatam, Sistema B and 11 other social enterprises</td>
<td>They build houses, support the local entrepreneurs affected by the fire and reforest the native forest in the affected zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Open social innovation

This study attempts to demonstrate that open social innovation is a strategy for social enterprises to be innovative and engage in a sustainable business model. Open social innovation is a complex phenomenon, requiring an analysis of the creation, the development of innovation, and actors involved which is pivotal in understanding the OSI approach in each of them. Appendix 3 presents representative quotations and events that were relevant to the research.

5.2.1 Development of innovation

5.2.1.1 Inside-out

Inside-out process refers to sharing knowledge, ideas with different organisations in external environment. Overall, the findings suggest that the inside-out process was representative in the implementation of the product or service: for example, selling the license of a software, partnership with an important publisher, promoting social innovation and inviting others to participate in the challenges. As mentioned by Alejandra:

*It would have been a different story, if we did not share the idea with the best publisher of Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries because we were able to go to the market rapidly and easily.*

It is very important to share their ideas with others and find the key partners to develop their product more rapidly. Also, the co-founder of Redalmacen was interviewed by a TV show to share their innovation and soon after, they were contacted by Coca Cola. Coca-Cola licensed the software, allowing the co-founders to test and share the software with other local store owners. As noted by Veronica:
Thanks to this TV show, one of the Marketing managers of Coca Cola contacted us because he was interested in the software. To summarise, after a few meetings, we closed a deal where they purchased from us 300 licenses which we distributed throughout north of Chile.

Inside-out process is identified as the engagement of social enterprises in being more open about their ideas and sharing their products: i.e. for licensing or selling them. Some cases demonstrate that inside-out helps to test the product without any financial rewards.

5.2.1.2 Outside-in

Regarding the outside-in process, six out of the seven social enterprises, engage in this process in order to understand the external sources and integrating it in the development of the innovation. In general, the findings suggest that outside-in process was representative of getting feedback from the external environment and improve the innovation. E3P creators of Granjero mentioned: *In the Fiis, we shared a prototype and encourage other people to play and test it. There were very good results, people really got motivated, they saw that it was very entertaining and it felt like you actually found the collaboration and other values.*

Moreover, other social enterprises engage in collaboration to overcome the challenges faced after the first year of growth. These collaborations help to find the partners and networks necessary to be more innovative. The outside-in process allowed them to find ideas in the external environment and incorporate them in their enterprises. A noted by CasaCo founder:

*CasaCo provides support and forces the collaboration. There are basic activities that seek to share the ideas and challenges, to be more open and aware of what each organisation does and how to help them collaborate with each other.*

In addition, there are circumstances where organisations need to outsource the technology in order to develop the idea. As explained by the co-founder of Broota: *Today, we are in a networking process and creating the new technology. At the beginning, we outsourced the technology in order to create the platform.*

Lastly, the social enterprises engage in strong collaboration with universities providing ideas for the development of the business model and in some cases, support financially the social enterprises. Balloonlatam is working with young professionals to work with local entrepreneurs to develop their product and service.

5.2.1.3 Coupled process

The coupled process refers to the combination of inside-out and outside-in approach. These processes were significant in all cases and it was mentioned numerous times by the founders of the social enterprises. The coupled process occurred intensively in the creation of the idea and
the implementation of the innovation. Each actor provided different expertise in order to develop the product. This process was intense as reported by the CEO of Emprediem regarding the process:

*It is a diverse group, EmpreDiem provides the expertise in working with local entrepreneurs, Entel provides the connectivity and the use of mobile phones. Then Ministry of the Women provides the expertise in terms of gender guidelines. Everyone learns about the program; the Ministry learns about entrepreneurship and innovation as does Entel and ourselves as well.*

Similarly, the coupled process involves members of local communities in exploring the opportunities and threats. This process helps to explore and exploit the resources of the local entrepreneurs. It is a process that engages everyone at the beginning. As mentioned by the co-founder of Balloonlatam:

*For the duration of the creation of the business model, we live with at least two members of the community. We co-create the work plan with different teams of local and national representatives as well as defining the long-term work plan in the community.*

Nevertheless, in the process of creating the last product, the diverse expertise to engage in the coupled process allowed them to explore and exploit more rapidly creating a strategic alliance that allowed them to integrate all resources for the success of the innovation. As mentioned by the director of Granjero:

*Four big actors, Sistema B, Idemax, Devir and Ludoismo. All participated in different areas: Idemax, Sistema B created the game. At the same time, Devir, the publisher would provide feedback of the game. Ludoismo is the game expert and gave the last touch.*

Also, the co-founder of Redalmacen highlighted the fact of co-creating the business model such as the creation of a name, marketing and the definition of their objectives as a social enterprise, allowed them to offer a service for local store keepers rather than only a software. This collaboration allowed them to innovate and find sustainable business models for their social enterprise. As reported by co-founder of Redalmacen:

*After working and co-creating with Socialab, the concept of the business model and the name Redalmacen was created. Even though we were offering a software, the business model is not only plug in a computer and teaching a software. It is more than that: it is a useful tool for local store owners and for which we also provide advice and support to them.*

### 5.2.2 Actors involved

There are two types of collaboration; the first one is cross-sectoral collaboration that stands for diverse groups of social enterprises and universities, private-public organisations. The results
suggest strong collaboration among the different actors. For that reason, it is divided in sections and explained by the interviewees:

5.2.2.1 Cross-sectoral collaboration
The collaboration with diverse social enterprises is also very valuable, because allow organisations to work collaboratively with multiple actors and joining forces to provide new products that will generate works to local people as it is define by the co-founder of Balloonlatam:

*The alliance depends on the locality and in each locality, we have different alliances. Karun, a social enterprise with a new line of sunglasses made of jeans’ material, are also working with entrepreneurs in balloon. They are making the raw material, cutting jeans, etc.*

Moreover, Director of E3P mentioned the diverse group involved in the creation of the board game for the creation and development of the board game:

*The three members from different fields, gather and talk about the idea of a board game that teaches the new economy. Because they thought that they could create a different board game.*

Likewise, director of CasaCo mentioned the relation with previous co-workers for the creation of a space that generates collaboration among different social enterprises, which helps them to innovate and create different products and services. As mentioned by the co-founder of CasaCo:

*After the three of us had left Start up Chile, we kept in contact, observed a problem and created a collaboration methodology where entrepreneurs can be more beneficial than working alone in their offices.*

5.2.2.2 Private-Public organisations and universities:
The collaboration between private-public institutions for the development of the product and service is important, because it helps them to create other projects. For instance, the creation of training programs for local storekeepers with regards to the efficiency of their systems and the importance of collaborating with different owners of the neighbourhood. Founder of Redalmacen mentions that working with public institutions can provide soft skills and personal development for their business:

*We, as a Redalmacen, a company called Chileenter and they donated some computers, and the programme was free for the local owners. They did not have to pay anything and they were given computers and the municipality helped with the infrastructure of computer labs to work in groups to teach the software. That was the support that the municipality gave us.*
Moreover, Director of Socialab also discusses how they define and promote different challenges in their website and the importance of collaborating with different actors to upload the innovative ideas:

*Private enterprises and public institutions work together to create social innovation challenges. Together, we define a challenge and put it on the platform and people start to upload their ideas to solve that challenge. What we do is to try to find solutions to problems.*

5.2.2.3 Motivation for collaborating

Finally, there is a motivation to generate these activities. The main drivers to collaborate and work together towards an innovative idea is to have a social purpose and bring social good to others, it is characterised by willingness and trust. Diverse actors and teams makes products and services easier. As mentioned by Director of Emprediem:

*Better results are accomplished when there is a group of people with different talents and common objectives. I will never make these alone, that's why collaboration is important.*

Moreover, all interviewees agree that the creators were driven to collaborate to bring forth a social change, and offer solutions, as mentioned by the co-founder of Balloonlatam:

*We started in 2011. I went to Kenya with two people that had contacted me through a blog. I did not know them. We were three madmen who came to do something, wanting to generate work through entrepreneurship and at the same time forming social leaders.*

5.3 Open collaborative projects

When the researcher asked about collaboration, all founders mentioned the co-creation of a project that was open and collaborative, which engaged in providing education for future generations, offering national governments innovative ideas for future public policies and creating a web-platform for the communities affected by the fires in the south of Chile. Based on the interviews, several initiatives that were born because of a social need with many people willing to work for that common purpose (Appendix 4). The findings suggest that once there is a common goal, a diverse group of individuals, founders of institutions, work together towards that goal. Thereby, this section describes a selection of the most relevant projects that fulfils the two most important characteristics: openness and collaboration. In addition, this section outlines the themes of open, collaborative projects such as; defining the project, local development, actors involved and barriers (Figure 8).
5.3.1 Defining the project

5.3.1.1 Methods process
The methods process is characterised as genuinely open, where anyone seeks control and where people are serving a common agenda to help others. As mentioned by the Sistema B, Co-founder:

*It is happening, and we can share something new, those collaborative processes are unique, genuinely open, no one seeks to control it, where people are not imposing an agenda.*

Moreover, Colusión de amor, was another collaborative project with diverse actors working towards the same goal and serving one agenda. In a very short period, co-create the crowdfunding website while others were responsible of the advertisement and awareness of the project. At the end, more than 10 social enterprises worked together. As reported by co-founder of CasaCo:

*Colusión de Amor was a project that emerged between Broota, Sistema B, and a series of other social enterprises. In mid-February, during the forest fires and crises, they decided to use the tools and create a crowdfunding campaign to help those affected by the fires.*

5.3.1.2 Flexible organisations
The organisation’s structure is flexible, the projects are not rigid. There are certain agreements to sign but it is based on trust and dialogue. As it was mentioned throughout the interviews, trust is important. Director of Fiis mentions:

*Fiis has been significant in terms of its methods of collaboration and how it is organized. No one owns it. However, the content is organised by several organisations in order to serve one agenda. Fiis serves all organizations and is their common objective. There isn't a strict method, some general agreements are signed as the purpose of Fiis and they may or may not be included in the program.*
5.3.2 Local development

In the case of Fiis, the open collaborative projects where adapted throughout the countries which helped them to innovate adapting it to the needs of the Latin American countries. The projects are not owned by those who created them but are shared with different institutions which adapt them to their realities. As mentioned by Co-founder Sistema B:

The Fiis involve around 50 organisations and is in 13 cities in the region. It is not control by any organisation and it is a phenomenon in Latin America.

Moreover, this quote exemplifies how the project adapts to the needs of the organisations involved in providing a social good. As reported by director, Fiis:

For instance, one of the first social enterprises in Paraguay, came to Fiis to learn about it. This year it has been organised by other social organisations in their ecosystem.

5.3.3 Actors involved

In the case of Colusion de Amor, the organisations involved were several; more than ten social enterprises created the project allowing it to expand rapidly. Moreover, Fiis- is an annual event that invites different organisations to work together towards the organisation of the festival:

There are countries that have found a good way to organise Fiis; that is to hold it in conjunction with another existing event. For example, in Paraguay, they have an annual event like Ted and they combine this event with the Fiis.

5.3.4 Barriers

Open Collaborative projects are not easy tasks, and they have their challenges. There is no financial gain behind the idea, and the purpose is to bring good and provide an impact. These projects are difficult to predict, and one of the barriers is the ego of the organisations involved in it. Even though there is no financial reward, there is still debate over demonstrating the level of organisations’ presence. As mentioned by the Director of Socialab:

When there are many organisations, there are egos that need to be managed. The control of egos may be unavoidable if one wants not to, for example, get his logo first or look bigger or smaller, etc. But in the end, are details as always one tries to get the value and those more important things and those things that are in details.
6. Discussion

This chapter aims to answer the research questions by integrating all the analysis and the themes in the data with the existing literature about open social innovation and open collaborative projects thus to highlight the most relevant contributions of the study. As a reminder, the research questions are:

- **Q₁** How is open social innovation a strategy for social enterprises?
- **Q₂** How do social enterprises engage in open, collaborative projects?
- **Q₂.2** What are the barriers to open collaborative projects?

6.1: Q₁ How is open social innovation a strategy for social enterprises?

Open social innovation is a framework for adapting open innovation in social enterprises, because it enables them to collaborate and innovate for the development of the enterprises. The researcher found that social entrepreneurs are driven by the altruist purpose of “changing the world” (Director, CasaCo). However, as a means for reaching a more sustainable business model and engaging in finding the right solution to the problem, it can have a negative impact because the solution and problem are not necessarily suitable in terms of sustainability.

For that reason, to find the right solution, service or product that will help to solve the problems, a more open approach towards the development of their organisations is important. Based on Chesbrough and Di Minin (2014), social mission organisations engage in an inside-out and outside-in strategy; for example, by outsourcing services in different locations, they can find local resources that can help the organisations to overcome barriers.

This research suggests that in fostering social innovation there is a more important dimension to consider, that being the coupled process in which outside-in and inside-out strategies are combined. Since these enterprises are empowered to make a social change and at the same time are responsible for the organisations’ sustainability, it is important to use the coupled process as a strategy. The OSI framework is broadly applied throughout the genesis, development and implementation of the innovation. This leads us to the important aspect of the development of the innovation: the actors involved and the benefits of engaging in the coupled process. All cases demonstrate a strong collaboration with different actors and the element of coupled process in finding solutions to the problems.
6.1.2 Development of innovation

6.1.2.1 Inside-out:
Five out of the seven social enterprises were identified as using an inside-out approach. This happened in the prototype stage in the case of Granjero, CasaCo, Redalmacen, Balloonlatam and Socialab. According to Dahlander and Gann (2010), organisations disclose their innovation in order to gain innovative ideas and scale more rapidly. However, Redalmacen was created because of the users’ need for their local store and this idea was shared with the public in a national TV show which, in turn, attracted the attention of the marketing manager of Coca Cola, who approached them and licensed their software to the best local owners throughout north of Chile. This opportunity allowed them to benefit economically and test their software with other local store keepers. According to Gassmann and Enkel (2004), the inside-out process is “bringing ideas to the market, selling/licensing by transferring ideas to the market” (2004, p. 7). Moreover, these cases demonstrate that inside-out occurs in the development stage of the product.

6.1.2.2 Outside-in:
All social enterprises engage in an outside-in approach, both by working this way themselves and also by supporting it through other institutions. The outside-in process enriches the organisation with external knowledge and information that comes from their customers, suppliers and stakeholders, and this process can increase the innovation of the organisation (Gassmann and Enkel, 2004; Chesbrough, 2014). In all cases, the enterprises reach out to other sources, organisations and potential customers to understand their needs and how to potentially engage them in disruptive social innovation and in work towards the development of their products and services. One of the key findings is that, the more open the organisations, the better are the results for them. As mentioned, “be more open and collaborate with each other” (Director, CasaCo) in order to share the ideas and overcome the challenges.

6.1.2.3 Coupled process:
According to Chesbrough and Di Minin (2014), OSI is the framework associated with social mission organisations which provides an inside-out and outside-in approach. However, the empirical findings suggest that social enterprises also engage in a “coupled” process of open innovation rather than only one or the other (Gassmann and Enkel, 2004). All the organisations in the study are sustainable and innovative when solving some of the social challenges that the society may face. Moreover, consumers are also engaged in co-creating with other users, while
the firms work on the innovation of the product (Nambiisan, 2002). These findings demonstrate that social enterprises are using external sources for ideas (outside-in) but, at the same time, can create for the market (inside-out). In these cases, the coupled process means working with the local communities for their development and helping in the process of using all the valuable resources.

Based on the findings, the coupled process happens intensively at the beginning of the work plan, but, depending on the nature of the social enterprise and the support and linkage to the different actors, it can also occur within the process of development of the innovation. As mentioned by Gassmann and Enkel (2004), “companies that decide on the coupled process as a key process, combine the outside-in process (to gain external knowledge) with the inside-out process (to bring ideas to market). These companies cooperate with other companies in strategic networks” (p. 12). It happens intensively at the beginning of the work plan, because it is important to collaborate from the start. As noted “we co-create the work plan with different teams of local and national representatives” (Co-founder, Balloonlatam). This coupled-process strategy defines the long-term work plan at the national and local level.

6.1.3 Actors involved

Collaboration is a key element in open and social innovation (Chalmers, 2012). The findings demonstrate two types of collaboration, the first involving cross-sectional collaboration with multiple partners, and diverse social enterprises. The second is the alliance with private and public organisations and universities. Montgomery, et al. (2012) suggest that successful changes rely on strong collaboration among different actors because it provides diverse viewpoints on the same problem. The more different approaches are found in looking at a problem and the more diverse they are, the bigger the impact on the society by an organisation engaging in this form of innovation. According to West and Bogers (2014), there are different ways to engage in coupled innovation in collaborative networks with multiple partners. There is abundant literature about open innovation concerning collaboration and the types of collaboration between SMEs such as bi-lateral relations (Vanhaverbeke and Cloodt, 2006). The collaboration partners and the strategic alliances, which contribute to innovation, are discussed below.
6.1.3.1 Cross-sectoral collaboration:
Social enterprises strongly engage in innovation-related collaboration with similar or different enterprises. The design and development of the services and products involves the collaboration of three different actors with diverse expertise. This cross-sectoral collaboration allows them to jointly create a new product and service. Collaboration with other social enterprises in local communities allows them to provide a product and in return creating jobs for the local entrepreneurs in the region. For instance, a group of people may generate the raw material that another enterprise uses in its production. The case of Karun and Balloonlatam; two social enterprises with different approaches that are generating jobs for local entrepreneurs and promoting their services by selling high quality products.

6.1.3.2 Private, Public organisations and universities:
Partnerships with universities, private and public institutions enable social enterprises to scale and reach further objectives. In the case of universities, they promote the research and future development of the programme. For example, Balloon has a strategic alliance with the University of Leeds, which has a research program about sustainable local development, focusing on social innovation and local development. Balloonlatam also works with universities in Chile to promote jobs and local economies. Moreover, public and private institutions work closely with social enterprises to create programs for education and the generation of more income through entrepreneurial practices. Collaboration with these institutions enables social enterprises to generate programs that are innovative and solve societal problems.

6.1.3.3 Motivation for collaborating
To generate the coupled process, first there are certain elements that enable social enterprises to engage in the development of a product. The most common ones mentioned in the interviews were a common goal, trust, willingness and an altruist purpose. There must be willingness to work together for a common goal towards solving a social problem that affects them and the society. To support the organisations, everyone can bring their trust and belief in the diverse capacities. Once there is trust among the social enterprises, the development of the product is easier.

All interviewees said that a personal experience triggered in them the desire to give their lives a meaningful purpose, which, in turn, motivated them to create an organisation with a social purpose, where the co-founders engage in collaboration towards a common goal. In each of the organisations, there was a genuine purpose for creating social change and it was part of their
desire to find solutions. These findings suggest that the nonpecuniary motivations were the main reason for starting up and that in some cases there was not any thinking about the financial sustainability and financial gains of the organisations.

6.2: Q2 How do social enterprises engage in open collaborative projects?

According to the findings, those who engage in collaborative projects are not firm-centric but socio-centric. The main goal is to solve a social problem cooperatively. There are more than 10 organisations involved in the creation of the project of Colusion de Amor and Fiis and engaging in mass collaboration for the crowdfunding or international event (Tjornbo, no date; Tapscott Don and Williams Anthony, 2008; Ryan, 2014). The impact of these projects is unknown and difficult to predict. According to Baldwin and Von Hippel (2009), open collaborative projects are desirable for the social welfare of society and bring forth the creation of new innovative ideas. They also suggest that a more open collaboration should be encouraged by governments and policymakers.

However, their studies about open collaborative projects are from the perspective of technological change and open-sources software and are not particularly focused on social enterprises. Moreover, the analysis was based on the transaction and communication costs involved in OCP and this study analyses how the project is defined, the local development and actors involve. Similarly, Piller and West (2014) point out that the process for coupled open innovation is mostly studied from the perspective of open-source and crowdsourcing platforms. Together these literatures allowed us to provide a hybrid of the approaches and define the phenomenon of open collaborative projects in social mission organisations.

There is a difference between open social innovation and open collaborative projects. OSI is the creation of a product or service that will be sustainable in time. OCP is the collaboration of more than 10 social mission organisations, which brings together the creation of the crowdfunding to help people affected by the fire and international event of social innovation. Another important characteristic of open collaborative projects is the absence of financial reward in the process or in the results, because the purpose is to help others.

6.2.1 Defining the project:

6.2.1.1 Methods of the process

There are core institutions that identify the problem, inviting other social enterprises to participate and collaborate to co-create the project in the interest of the society. According to Piller and West
(2014), the formulation process has been described very broadly in tournament-based crowdsourcing. However, this does not only happen in such crowdsourcing but also in the organisation of an event and a website to donate. The crowdsourcing platform is to share ideas about how to support the social enterprise and present it to future governments and the president. This initiative was created because in the Latin American legal system there is no difference between a social enterprise and SMEs.

Firstly, the methods process is described as “unique, genuinely open” because none of the organisations is imposing an agenda but trying to identify and respond to social needs. Moreover, it is creating solutions for communities in the region, which is created by the social enterprises helping everyone involved in the problem.

6.2.1.2 Flexible organisation

Flexibility is needed to engage in these types of projects. However, there are general agreements about defining the project and the different tasks that each of the social enterprises is responsible for. According to Piller and West (2014), the organisations need to define and determine the resources available and the willingness to provide their services for the common objective. This common objective defines the project.

6.2.2 Local development

The different projects are serving the local needs of the communities and are adapted to the local conditions. These projects are undertaken in more than one city, and the organisations involve local institutions, including public and private organisations. The projects are not owned by those who create it; rather, they are shared with other institutions (partners). The importance of the project is to create, scale, and sustain new spaces for collaboration, to learn from this and to act towards a common purpose. All organisations involved locally engage in the development of the project and its sustainability. It is not imposed; the methods are shared so that it can be replicated throughout Latin America. According to Baldwin and Von Hippel (2009), creation and replication are an effect of communities engaged as groups in innovation, rather than of individuals, and this can create a bigger impact because there is more than one individual working and all involved are sharing their ideas for the creation of a common good.
6.2.3 Actors involved
According to Walker and Siegel (2014), there are cases of mass collaboration such as TED, Wikipedia and other platforms created massively for everyone. However, these collaborations are also created by social enterprises that address a specific social need. When there is an intensive collaborative initiative by a diverse group of people with different kinds of expertise, they will be able to create it in a timely manner and elaborate innovative ideas for others.

6.3: Q2.1 What are the barriers to open collaborative projects?
Barriers to open collaborative projects:
There are values involved that may possibly help with the development of these projects. One of them is the genuine trust among social enterprises and engagement in collaboration with the different people. However, there are also challenges such as the differences among partners. In defining the project, at the beginning it is challenging to have a common agenda, sometimes it is a “chaos” (Co-founder, Sistema B), because everyone has an opinion about the project with different suggestions.

The definition of the project is the most challenging part because talking to more than 10 people about a topic and defining it, is very difficult. Another important aspect is the egos involved because once the product or service is being delivered, which organisations should come first or which ones are mentioned before the others, becomes an issue. Even if there are no financial rewards, there are egos involved as to who has a bigger logo on the main page or advertisement of the project. As noted “managing egos becomes challenging.” (Director, Socialab), the ego issue may be unavoidable and it is a barrier in the definition and implementation of the project. Moreover, it so happens that organisations want to put their agendas first as to how these projects can benefit them but it is important to remind them about the purpose of the project.

Additionally, people have their own organisational structure and work differently which is difficult in the implementation phase of the project. In those situations, someone must facilitate in order to ensure a common purpose and succeed in the execution of the project. First, it is important to have a common purpose, and then comes collaboration among different organisations. Lastly, the commercial agenda can be a barrier in the open, collaborative projects: whether to advertise products and services on the website or at the location of the project. These can become a barrier but it is important to remember the common purpose of the project.
To summarise, it is important to mention the three barriers that can lead to unsuccessful cases in open collaborative projects: to have a common agenda, issue of egos, and commercial agenda, and to overcome them becomes an essential goal. As noted “someone should facilitate for it to succeed” (Director, Emprendiem).

6.4 Summary
In answering question 1, OSI is a strategy for social enterprises in the context of generation of ideas and the sustainability of social enterprises. According to Chesbrough, an inside-out and outside-in approach is applied where social enterprises disclose and share their innovation and organisations are benefitted through external resources. However, the most important is the coupled process, which is the combination of both inside-out and outside-in where collaboration occurs intensively in the generation of ideas rather than later, in the implementation and development of the product. The actors identified in the collaboration are diverse and working with different social enterprises or private-public organisations and universities, engage in developing the idea and its implementation. Lastly, in order to become more innovative and sustainable, the motivation to work together and the willingness to provide resources was important. In answering question 2, these social enterprises engage in open, collaborative projects, which are, not firm centric but social-centric, meaning that instead of creating a product, all those interested in solving a problem and working together are invited. The social enterprises define the project as having a common purpose, which is genuinely open and collaborative, and that no one is in control. There is flexible organisation with general agreements where everyone can contribute. These projects are created by the local organisations in the ecosystem and the actors involved provide their diverse expertise. Lastly, there are barriers to open collaborative projects such as, reaching a consensus on how to define the project and egos. For example, agreements on the size of the logo for a social enterprise or who creates it. Collaboration is not an easy task and it can interfere in the process of open, collaborative projects.
7. Conclusion

7.1 General Conclusion
This work has demonstrated that open innovation is applied in social enterprises and their engagement in open, collaborative projects. It provides a contribution to the literature gaps in regards to open social innovation in social enterprises, and their engagement in open, collaborative projects. This work is a contribution to the related literature and social enterprises in emerging markets. In most cases, innovation needs not to be confidential and not shared as these cases have demonstrated that the openness’ at the beginning of the idea can have a great impact in the innovation process and organisations.

Firstly, open innovation happens intensively in the creation of the solution instead of the development and implementation. The findings suggest that social enterprises are applying the coupled process for bringing innovative solutions with regards to the social problems. For instance, creating spaces of collaboration within social enterprises to overcome the barriers after their first year of growth or helping local entrepreneurs in rural areas in developing their products. According to (Chesbrough and Di Minin, 2014), the inside-out and outside-in are identified in social mission organisations but it does not mention the coupled process. These strategies such as coupled process allow social enterprises to engage in collaboration to grow and become more sustainable and provide innovative social innovation. Moreover, the collaboration with diverse actors strengthen their capacities to scale more rapidly.

Secondly, social enterprises agree that this collaboration with diverse actors allow them to engage in open, collaborative projects, which are those, that work for a common goal. These open,
collaborative projects are not imposed by one or two members rather function through a collaborative action inviting all who want to work together to solve a societal problem. Moreover, these open, collaborative projects are promoting new public policies, educating the masses about social innovation, and supporting the local communities after an environmental disaster. It is the exchange of ideas and values, when non-profit organisations, businesses, and social entrepreneurs learn new ideas from each other and bring about solutions to a problem. Networks, partnerships, and collaboration can provide means to tackle the social problems that many people face nowadays. To create open, collaborative projects, different organisations must cross the boundaries that separate social entrepreneurs, non-profit organisations, governments and businesses and work together to create a social value that will finally result in collaboration for the advancement of the society.

Thirdly, open, collaborative projects are difficult to create, in some cases unpredictable and the results are unknown. Some barriers were identified for the creation of the projects, one being the ego, and many people working together can lead to difficult and tense situations. Everyone having an opinion and trying to create a common goal for everyone else is challenging. At the end of the project, the advertisement part dealing with who collaborated less or more and how big the logo is; can become a barrier for future projects. However, the findings suggest that, in the end, once the barriers are overcome, the desire for creating a social impact will bring forth positive results.

Lastly, this dissertation demonstrated that open social innovation in social enterprises is not only focused in the firm but also in creating spaces for collaboration. It demonstrates that there can be a hybrid of Chesbrough and Von Hippel approach. The first one, firm centric to be more innovative and the second one creating OCP for the betterment of a society. These collective actions are demonstrating a phenomenon that it is occurring in Latin America and their ecosystem is characterised by collaboration among the actors.

7.2 Managerial implications
The findings and conclusions provide further support for open social innovation by including a coupled process, the combination of inside-out and outside-in. It demonstrates that there are social enterprises engaged in open, collaborative projects that provide a social welfare. OSI is firm centric where there is a combination of for-profit and providing a social good. OCP is social-centric providing programs and services for a social good without any financial return where
everyone is invited to collaborate with the project. The combination of OSI and OCP provides tremendous opportunities for other social entrepreneurs and is strengthening the relation with other members of the ecosystem of social enterprises. Moreover, the vast majority of OI research to date is particularly focus in developed countries with a focus on technological enterprises; but the findings suggest that it can occur in non-technological enterprises. In summary, it demonstrates that social enterprises are using an OSI strategy and they are engaging in OCP for collective action, and providing solutions to all members of the broader communities. In turn, it demonstrates the collaborative projects can have a greater effect by demonstrating new forms of mass-collaboration and providing an impact for everyone who is involved in them.

7.3 Suggestion for future research
The author has identified four suggestions for future research. Firstly, it is interesting to analyse and contrast open social innovation in developed and emerging markets which can lead to improve the ways that social enterprises are working towards a social good. It will be interesting to observe if these practices are occurring in other parts of the world. Secondly, considering the collaboration with diverse actors, and the engagement in a more open strategy, it will be exciting to analyse the ecosystem of social enterprises. Thirdly, it is beneficial to conduct an in-depth study about the engagement and purpose of each of the actors involved in OCP which, in turn, can lead to other cases of mass-collaboration and their contributions in non-technological services and products. Fourthly, a more in-depth study of the barriers of OCP can provide significant understanding of unsuccessful projects.
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