

Improving Open Innovation: The Power of Social Media Knowledge Networks

Constantin BRATIANU¹
Andreea Bianca CAMARA²

Abstract

In a digital ecosystem characterized by massive data exchange and constant interactions, social networks have become essential tools for capturing and sharing knowledge. This research explores the impact of groups created in social media on Open Innovation processes, focusing on the types of knowledge captured from consumers and their innovative potential. The study explores how these groups facilitate knowledge flows, contributing to organizational development and innovation through more authentic and transparent collaboration. The research also highlights the role of these digital communities in increasing organizations' ability to absorb and harness consumer knowledge. The results suggest that social media groups are hubs for exchanging ideas, feedback, and co-creation, providing a competitive advantage through access to relevant and up-to-date information and knowledge. The study contributes to the understanding of the mechanisms by which online interactions generate value for organizations and to the development of effective digital knowledge management strategies.

Keywords: open innovation, social media, knowledge, knowledge transfer, social media groups, customers, communication.

JEL classification: D12, D83, D85, O31

DOI: 10.24818/RMCI.2025.2.314

1. Introduction

In a digital ecosystem marked by numerous connections of huge amounts of data generated daily, social networks have been configured as systems for behavioral exploration and inter-entity relationships, to create knowledge flows and extract subject and personal insights, to capture both traditional and new behavioral information (Sun, Wang & Jeyaraj, 2020; Treem & Leonardi, 2012). In this context of massive data exchange messages known as user-generated content (UGC) and user content end up exchanging knowledge important for organizational development

¹ Constantin Bratianu, Professor Emeritus, UNESCO Department for Business Administration, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania. President of the Section of Economics, Academy of Romanian Scientists, constantin.bratianu@gmail.com

² Andreea Bianca Camara, National University of Political Studies and Public Administration (SNSPA), 012104, Bucharest, Romania, camaraandreea@gmail.com

and innovation (Bresciani & Ferraris, 2016). Knowledge is a strategic resource (Bratianu, 2022), and customer knowledge management involves all the knowledge fields, i.e. rational, emotional, and spiritual (Bratianu & Bejinaru, 2019, 2023).

Organizations that continuously innovate are those that maintain their competitive advantage (Del Giudice et al., 2019; Scuotto et al., 2020). Customer knowledge management plays an essential role in product and service innovation as well as maintaining competitive advantage. The customer is the epicenter of any business, attracting, capturing, and utilizing consumer knowledge for innovative purposes (Xiong et al., 2021; Alinasab et al., 2022). Following a developmental perspective of open innovation, De Zubielqui et al. (2019) pointed out that knowledge flows originating from social networks, attracted by actors external to the organization, have the potential to develop open innovation processes.

Social networks are the most common tool for knowledge sharing both from organizations to consumers and vice versa. So far, most studies are focused on the technical aspects neglecting the impact of knowledge dynamics present in this social ecosystem (Papa et al., 2018). This paper aims to alleviate the limitations of studies in this field by analyzing the impact of social media customer groups on knowledge attraction. Social media generates a new dimension of collaboration and the construction of new knowledge (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). The very nature of these communication channels increases the honesty of consumers and their responses, transparency, and willingness to participate in knowledge sharing. The knowledge present in these networks is accessible to anyone interested in a topic, feedback, opinions about products or services, experience, etc. (Majchrzak et al., 2013; Treem & Leonardi, 2012).

The creation of social media communication groups, and chat groups such as Facebook Messenger, WhatsApp, LinkedIn Messenger, telegram, etc., is a real and natural consequence of the evolution of the digital space. These groups are narrower, interest, pleasure, product, and service-oriented, are more targeted to a certain standard of customers, and are centers and hubs for knowledge exchange and co-creation. The members of these groups are directly interested in the issues on which they are focused and are willing to share knowledge, buy, exchange ideas, or help, which makes the knowledge generated in these groups more accurate, useful, and meaningful for open innovation processes (Yang et al., 2001; Pérez-González, et al., 2017). Also, these groups promote inter-generational learning (Bratianu et al., 2011). The impact of these groups is significant by stimulating the type of consumer increasing the possibility of co-creation, generating new ideas and real-time feedback from consumers, and increasing the capacity for knowledge absorption in the organization.

The present research seeks and answers two research questions:

- (1) What is the impact of groups created in social media for open innovation processes?
- (2) What types of knowledge and their innovative potential are captured from consumers in these groups?

Properly used and targeted to consumers, communication strategies on these networks can generate resources and constant flows of new knowledge for organizations (Mcafee, 2006; Sun et al., 2020). The variety of communication possibilities, from messengers, small groups, public message groups, advertisements, etc. is a process that transforms the traditional knowledge management environment into continuous person-centered knowledge conversations (Majchrzak et al., 2013). The knowledge present in these networks is accessible to anyone, a feature that may lead to knowledge risks (Bratianu et al., 2020). They can be re-read and re-interpreted in terms of consumer interests and behaviors, as well as tools for conveying and collecting feedback, and opinions about products or services, experiences, etc. (Majchrzak et al., 2013; Treem & Leonardi, 2012).

2. Literature review

Open innovation is the systematic process put into practice by organizations that aim to incorporate external knowledge and collaborative perspectives to improve innovation capabilities. The defining aspects of this type of innovation are novelty, manageability, and co-creation with consumers (Del Giudice et al., 2015). The use of social media groups that allow access to real, new, and concrete consumer perspectives transforms passive consumers into active contributors, facilitating co-creation and reducing the risks of product acceptance or market integration (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). These groups thus facilitate a dynamic exchange of knowledge that enables the identification of trends, tendencies, anticipation of needs, and identification of growth strategies (Roser et al., 2009).

The modern age of technology implies a leveraging of intellectual resources (Edvardsson et al., 2012). In today's information age, where economic competitiveness is largely driven by technological progress and digitalization of organizations, the most valuable resources are no longer tangible ones, but those related to the organization's intellectual capital, knowledge, expertise, and experience (Murray et al., 2016). Effective management of both internal and external knowledge, along with managing the processes of knowledge creation, integration of knowledge flows, and adaptability, is the foundation of sustainability and an essential factor for continuous innovation and the creation of competitive advantage (Bratianu, 2022; Papa et al., 2018).

Knowledge is an infinite resource, and the management of this resource requires both a favorable climate that facilitates the generation, transfer, and sharing of knowledge and a system for knowledge utilization. Knowledge sharing contributes to the formation of knowledge linkages, which in turn support the development of those segments of the organization that are responsible for knowledge absorption.

To develop open innovation capabilities, a key factor is the external knowledge of the organization, especially that of consumers. These can contribute significantly to improving organizational innovation, an aspect highlighted by many studies (Pedrosa et al., 2013; Chesbrough, 2003). However, for the development of open innovation activities the absorptive capacity of the organization is a primary

condition (Huizingh, 2011; Ooms et al., 2015, Rangus et al, 2017). By absorptive capacity, the organization is endowed with a set of practices, routines, and processes that enable the assimilation, transformation, exploration, and exploitation of knowledge to gain competitive advantage (Zahra & George, 2002). According to Ortega-Gutiérrez et al (2021), social media is a factor in increasing knowledge absorptive capacity by increasing organizational learning, as well as a facilitator of knowledge-sharing and co-creation processes (Füller et al., 2011).

Innovation based on the external knowledge resources of consumers, customers, partners, competitors, etc., is generating significant benefits for the progressive development of organizations and contributes to social welfare (Henkel & Von Hippel, 2004). These communities, often structured as social network groups, are optimal spaces for testing products and services, organizing customer focus groups, and collecting feedback. For example, the features of a product can be improved based on user experiences, and this information can then be shared with other stakeholders for continuous optimization. Online groups and communities can act as a bridge between technology, organizations, and knowledge management, reinforcing the importance of this area as the use of digital technologies increases. In this sense, the Open Innovation (OI) approach is becoming increasingly popular and necessary for companies, facilitating the integration of internal and external knowledge to maintain competitiveness (Belso-Martínez et al., 2016). OI models involve drawing knowledge through both internal departments and external ecosystems, accelerating innovative processes (Chesbrough, 2006; Bresciani et al., 2016).

Even though social networks are recognized as powerful tools for knowledge sharing, there are still gaps in understanding how they can maximize their benefits and adapt to the specific needs of professionals. Some studies position social media and digital platforms in the middle of open innovation practices (Lifshitz-Assaf et al. 2018). However, these practices do not come without their pitfalls and liabilities. Open innovation cannot be sustainable without an internal management system that supports these practices to guarantee the organization's commitment to these systems and without concrete strategies for absorbing and selecting the captured knowledge (Barham et al. 2020). There is always the risk of encountering negative attitudes toward external knowledge and knowledge selection and interpretation are essential (West, et al. 2014).

The present study aims to provide a better understanding of how open innovation can be facilitated by social media groups and to identify the impact of knowledge dynamics on consumer response behavior as well as the innovative impact of knowledge captured from these groups. The approach of the study is not only from a theoretical but also from a practical perspective.

3. Methodology

Even though studies have recognized the power and importance of social media in open innovation processes, this research brings an element of novelty by

empirically exploring the results on the Romanian market, analyzing and highlighting the impact of social networking groups, and highlighting some useful practices for the business environment.

To achieve the research aims as well as to provide answers to the research questions, we conducted a set of 10 interviews that form the basis of this paper. The interviews consisted of 4 sets of questions designed to be open-ended and exploratory so that the entrepreneurs had the openness to express their perspectives, experiences, and insights. We targeted respondents from entrepreneurs and top and middle managers. The first set consisted of questions to identify and confirm the respondent's profile, the next 3 sets focused on: the innovative potential of knowledge from customers; the types of knowledge transferred to customer groups, and the factors facilitating knowledge transfer. To steer the discussion, additional, guiding questions were also asked and clarification was sought for certain answers.

The interviews were of average length, the shortest being 60 minutes and the longest 160 minutes. At the outset, participants were informed in advance of the purpose of the research, briefed on the meanings of the theoretical concepts, and guaranteed confidentiality of themselves and the organizations in which they work. The data collected will not present confidential information from any organization. Before the interview, each respondent was selected based on a simple profile, the main criterion being the use of social networks and online communities for communicating with customers. The participant and company profiles are presented in Table 1. All necessary ethical issues were discussed beforehand.

We chose this research method to allow us to analyze and collect significant amounts of data centered on the research questions. We are interested in delineating the practices and experiences we have had in communicating with customers through these types of channels. Delineating strategies and best practices, identifying impressions, opinions, and views on the impact on open innovation of these channels.

The limitations of the method are known, the limited number of interviews included in the research may affect the clarity of the data and the translatability of the results, but we believe that using a larger sample would have generated similar results. Developing a questionnaire along these lines may be a way to overcome the limitation. Another limitation is the interpretation of the data, this is subjective. A final limitation may be the interviewees' understanding of the theoretical conceptualization, but the preliminary discussions should have alleviated this limitation.

Respondent profiling

Table 1

Respondent	Age	Function	Years of experience	Company Industry
GC	30	Content Manager	6+	Marketing Agency
AD	29	CEO	4+	Events

Respondent	Age	Function	Years of experience	Company Industry
DI	34	Marketing Manager	3+	Retail
FM	41	Marketing Consultant	3	Events
DS	35	Communication expert	2	Retail
CB	39	Content Marketing Manager	4	Consultancy
RA	34	Manager	10	Courses and training
MI	42	Community Manager	7+	Publishing
SB	32	Content Manager	4+	IT courses
RG	29	Marketing Manager	6+	Online Events

Source: authors' research

4. Results and discussions

The interviews revealed a set of interesting insiders to mention about the quality of knowledge drawn from these groups, the absorptive capacity of organizations, and the impact of knowledge on open innovation processes. Table 2 highlights the most important mentions of our interviewees.

The first remark that we observe from the raw analysis of the interview data is represented by the fact that in the last three years the number of chat groups, and communication between consumers and the organization, has increased significantly. The main focus of these groups is geared towards customer loyalty and creating a relationship between the brand and its customers. Less so is the exploration of dynamic knowledge exchange methods and the impact of this knowledge in open innovation processes. All respondents mentioned that they currently communicate with consumers through WhatsApp, Facebook, Telegram, and Facebook Messenger groups, owning on average between three and five such groups. The main purpose of these groups is to connect and bring consumers closer to the organization, and the products and services offered, to win their loyalty through advisory processes, and perhaps to humanize the organization. GC, DI, DS, RA, RA, MI RG, and SB mentioned that the main purpose of these groups was upsell, or resale, as well as promotion of products and services.

The strategies of collecting consumer feedback after they have purchased, and loyalizing them by offering them a service after purchase was a secondary goal and emerged after they had launched the groups. Thus, the natural evolution of these groups for most of the respondents was from a sales channel to a knowledge-sharing facilitation channel. Three of the respondents (GC, FM, SB, and RG) emphasized that, from their perspective, these groups facilitate knowledge transfer from the company to consumers and vice versa. GC noted that "sometimes consumers get locked into a unitary, group think, but then someone comes along and breaks the lock with a single opinion... then a vortex of opinions and feedback is created that generate innovative ideas for us." But FM said, "Communicating through WhatsApp

groups brings us closer to consumers... but we give them a lot of advice in choosing products and we are transparent with them when it comes to the pluses and minuses of a choice, this generates trust and improves the way our services are perceived."

Interviews' synthesis

Table 2

Question section	Res.	Literature	Answer
Types of knowledge transferred in groups	CB	Alinasab et al., 2022; Bratianu & Bejinaru, 2019, 2023; Majchrzak et al, 2013; Nonaka, 1994; Sun et al., 2020.	They are a resource for help and support... after our intervention, we are more conservators, and the discord groups have become real support centers offered by clients for other clients... they discuss the problems they have encountered with the consultants, their experiences, they make recommendations and give you advice... we have often understood from them what they were looking for and we have tried to position ourselves in the market as close as possible to the needs identified, while respecting our vision and values.
	GC		There's a lot to say... I've noticed that each channel is different, consumers talk differently on each one and have a different set of expectations... Discord is clearly for gen Z or younger chair, WhatsApp is more universal, Facebook Messenger has remained for gen X... All consumers want to help other consumers, that's pretty much the general trend... they are also critical but willing to give advice, tell experiences and give real feedback... if they feel they are being influenced though they tend to rebel. They actively participate... a participant responds on average to 3 out of 5 messages sent by us...
	AD		We have several types of groups, each useful in its own way. The pre-event ones increase attendance at live events, the post-event ones are those that include receiving feedback and questions.
	DI		We receive recommendations, opinions, complaints, and opinions to improve the service, even upset customers... we most often send poll questions, offers, limited discounts or rewards for various actions.
	FM		We are usually most interested in the customer's experience on the spot, how they felt, what impression it left on them... participants share their professional experiences, ask us questions about the latest trends and we receive requests for specific speakers on certain topics.

Question section	Res.	Literature	Answer
The innovative potential of customer knowledge	DS	Chesbrough 2006; Chesbrough 2003; Papa et al., 2018; Pedrosa et al., 2013.	The most useful and with the greatest innovative impact, is that we can control the flow of knowledge... Those in the group answer us to what we need punctually. It greatly streamlines the process of selecting useful information in innovation processes.
	FM		...the feedback helps us to adapt future agendas, to grow... we've innovated a lot, from including networking groups for participants and including improving the way we access them... We've also dropped practices that were no longer useful for our consumers.
	SB		It has helped us a lot in our communication and loyalty processes, we have increased transparency and have been able to communicate more easily with customers on problematic issues... we have also developed a new reporting module based on customer suggestions.
	AD		...the active loyal communities are the ones that help us to innovate the most, where people tell us exactly what they want, what they need, they ask us for courses, they suggest speakers, they help us to set prices...
	DI		a lot of information has been helpful... we may not have changed exceptionally, but we have greatly improved the service... we have facilitated the return policy.
	DS		...helped us identify new trends before they became popular, we brought out a line of customized family clothing, at the behest of consumers.
	CB		Understood and used correctly I think it can help a lot in innovation processes, we based on the questions and needs identified we developed an online guide gratuity, for customers it was good to help them understand what steps to take in accessing funds, and it helped us to attract new qualified leads... and online webinars started all requested and requested by consumers in these groups... we concentrate the topics discussed and set a date to discuss the topic... webinars have generated growth in the community
Factors facilitating knowledge transfer	RA	Bratianu, 2022; Bratianu & Bejinaru, 2019, 2023; Edvardsson et al., 2012; Scuotto et al., 2020;	We most often use surveys and online mini-focus groups or brainstorming in these groups to collect and generate detailed feedback... The main challenge for us is that many users ask us for free courses, we try to offer as much as we can as a discount and free but we still struggle with educating the market on the value of the training.
	SB		Mainly we have open communication with consumers... they are the main testing group for new

Question section	Res.	Literature	Answer
		Xiong, ey al., 2021.	products and changes. The offers we make facilitate communication with them... we usually offer the product for free for testing, and they tell us what they have observed and get a discount, discount on subscription, etc.. This has worked for us...
	AD		... if you give them a form of content that they can respond to easily, they are willing to do it. Pools are useful, competitions help a lot, giveaway offers, etc. all increase their engagement...
	CB		A major barrier is the lack of an information filter - many entrepreneurs offer empirical solutions, not all of which are generally applicable
	MI		The main barrier is information noise - many people give unstructured advice that needs to be filtered out
	AD		If you give them a form of content that they can respond to easily, they are willing to do it. Pools are useful, competitions help a lot, and giveaway offers... all increase their engagement.
	RG		We have tried numerous summers to generate discussions, from storytelling, contests, pools, challenges etc.. Each one has had its yield... consumers are generally active on these groups... but the most active are when you show them that their opinion matters... when we do something guided or inspired by them, they are the first to test, we tell them and thank them publicly at launch... I think that recognition matters a lot in such processes that want to generate innovation.

Source: Authors' research

In terms of the impact of clusters on open innovation processes, according to the responses received the main impact these clusters had was in optimizing the user experience and increasing the performance of the service. Several factors make these groups potential innovation hubs, in that they allow users to comment with their preferences and judgments (Kijkuit & Ende 2010) and provide access to more people and a variety of external people and knowledge. In general, the types of knowledge exchanged in these groups are the tacit ones, and they also generate the greatest innovation potential. This is because social networks have more flexibility and freedom to cooperate, the consumer positions themselves in the role of co-creator if they trust that their opinions are valuable.

It is evident that social media groups facilitate the attraction of knowledge from the outside in, a process also called inbound innovation (Chesbrough & Crowther, 2006) by facilitating access to ideas and knowledge from outside the organization on controlled, diverse, and directed topics. The knowledge attracted and captured from these groups is of higher quality, quantity, and variety these three

elements increase the chances of facilitating open inbound innovation processes (Salge et al., 2013). In this context, RG mentioned that "yes, the groups brought many innovative ideas, but each time they were combined with internal direction and integrated with the company vision... the raw knowledge attracted from these groups does not innovate without the involvement of the organization or people inside." Also, on this topic DI mentioned that: "the feedback received on these groups has generally been useful, but much depends on the quality, clarity and ability to integrate it." CB mentioned that "radical innovations occur less often... but are possible." FM In highly competitive industries like ours, these types of groups and this way of communicating make the difference. We manage to constantly improve our events through the messages and ideas of the online community, mainly those in groups...we reward them with substantial discounts or even free invitations to events."

To generate open innovation firms must create controlled inputs of external knowledge into the organization. This knowledge integrated with the organization's internal knowledge and embedded in the organization's intellectual capital generates new innovative potential. To explore the innovative potential of knowledge from social media groups, we went down the chain caused by the role of social media groups, how knowledge capture is done, and the barriers and obstacles encountered.

The external knowledge acquired influences in a substantial way how innovation and creativity within an organization stimulate growth and management processes (Leonardi, 2014). Understanding how the knowledge captured from these groups, can impact and help the internal and managerial strategies of the organization as well as the open innovation processes is essential in this process (Enkel et al, 2009). In this note, DI mentioned "We realized late the impact that these groups have on product improvement, initially opening them up was not part of an internal marketing or management strategy. We followed the trend ourselves. We didn't think they would be of much use to us, but they couldn't have been much use either... when we started to realize that they were working and people there were buying, leaving us their opinions and eager to help we started to develop all sorts of strategies, contests, raffles and so on. They are now part of our communication strategy." The strategic orientation towards facilitating such an exchange automatically implies an internal knowledge set of attraction and absorption schemes.

The willingness, initiative, and ability of the organizational environment to absorb knowledge from the external environment, and to engage in constant knowledge exchange, significantly increase the organization's information levels, increase the organization's intellectual capital, and can improve internal processes as well as organizational gains (Schubert et al, 2023). In this context, the flexibility of the organizational environment contributes to improving the absorptive capacity (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Ortega-Gutiérrez et al., 2021). Respondents mentioned that the main obstacles encountered in attracting and capturing this knowledge are technological, the stand in the ability to handle this data, but also human, the resilience of employees to facilitate knowledge sharing and integrate the captured knowledge into work processes. MI noted that "The sheer volume of data is the most

problematic, we don't have someone sitting there watching all the chat conversations...We extract what we need then let the conversation flow as normal". While FM noted, "The most difficult is to extract the relevant knowledge that helps us, the biggest barrier would be the difficulty in separating the relevant opinions from the noise. We try to prioritize recurring feedback." While RG and GC emphasized that the human factor is the most important in this relationship, whether something is implemented or not depends on the potential impact on work processes and the willingness of employees to implement the feedback received.

In terms of the type of information conveyed through these groups, organizations most often convey in these groups educational content, informational content, statistics, stories from their own and other consumers' experiences and problems they have encountered, recommendations, or "how to..." content. In addition to these types of content, there are also offers, promotions, competitions, and sweepstakes. On the other hand, the information captured from consumers, and the most important for innovation processes, is tacit knowledge, in the form of impressions, opinions, experiences, and reviews, which seems to be the most frequently expressed by consumers in these groups. Sharing personal experience is a key source in the transmission of tacit knowledge (Nonaka, 1994). This highlights the importance of social media groups in knowledge transfer between consumers and the organization. This system of communication with consumers facilitates the transfer of tacit knowledge, it can be framed as part of the process of "socialization" proposed by Nonaka (1994) in the dynamic model of knowledge creation. AD mentioned that "these groupings have allowed us to take our events to a new level, to understand what our audience wants, needs and how we can attract them". FM, also from the physical events industry, mentioned the following: for us feedback is most important, we put a lot of emphasis on post-event servicing, and for a long time we struggled to ask attendees for honest opinions and impressions... now, we have managed to create a loyal group of consumers, who we invite pretty much everywhere, they have a clear and simple role, to sound the room, to see what the attendees need, what they liked, what they passed on in the breaks and to tell us clearly what we are doing well and what can be improved. ... we have been doing this for 2 years and so far it has helped us to grow."

Six of our respondents from the following industries, AD and FM from online and offline events, RA from specialized courses and training, DI and DS from retail, and CB from consulting on accessing European funds, told us that the use of groups not only facilitated the collection of feedback from customers but also increased consumer confidence in the products purchased. This form of communication has resulted in greater customer loyalty. These groups allow consumers controlled exposure to a limited audience, facilitating consumers' free and frank expression (Sun et al., 2020). These groups have become essential support for utilization and participation in products and services, with consumers becoming company ambassadors, helping other consumers reap the full benefits of their purchase. The constant exchange of views, impressions, opinions, and observations

has created an environment of trust, facilitating new flows of tacit and explicit external knowledge from consumers to the company.

Knowledge transfer does not occur automatically (Argote & Miron-Spektor, 2011), it is a trusting partnership, a constant exchange of opinions, impressions, and observations that has created an environment of trust, facilitating new flows of tacit and explicit external knowledge from consumers to the company. While RG noted that after three and a half years, its most active group, “a pandemic support group for entrepreneurs”, has spurred major innovations based on members' experiences, impressions, and feedback, generating a total shift of its consulting business towards a fully digitalized dimension. In terms of how these groups are helping to drive development and innovation in the company, T2 noted that WhatsApp groups have proven more useful for examining how services can be improved, as they include a loyal group of consumers eager to share constructive insights and genuine feedback. In this way, these consumers become co-creators of newly launched or improved services.

5. Conclusions

Today's companies, in the digital chaos being generated, do not seem to put enough effort into establishing routines and practices to drive open innovation through the implementation of captured knowledge. Flexibility on this note needs to be both human and technological, as well as organizational and project decision-making to drive in this direction and to cope with the large volume of data (Chesbrough & Crowther, 2006).

Following these considerations, we emphasize that social networks facilitate knowledge-sharing behavior in organizations, but for organizations to actively participate in innovation, the organization must have an internal capture system that is technologically and human compatible with this type of sharing. Regardless of the effectiveness of social networks in knowledge sharing, the type of knowledge shared as well as the absorptive capacity are the main barriers to integrating it into innovative processes.

On the other hand, these groups also have negative effects on the organization. They can generate significant social pressures, hate, or trolling which taken up in groupthink can lead to decreased sales, difficulties in strategy, negative feedback, etc. negative effects of traditional media such as loss of autonomy, social pressure for confirmation, and block in groupthink (Kijkuit & Ende 2010). Social networks allow users to comment with their preferences and judgments. Kijkuit and Ende (2010) show that larger networks lead to more ideas that are useful for innovation. Growing such a group and facilitating productive conversations in these groups also generates an increase in the amount and variety of knowledge available for exploration and innovation.

The present research delineates the gain on how social media groups contribute to collaborative knowledge construction, stimulating innovation and collaboration. Knowledge attraction in these groups is not only about technology

communication and collaboration. Included in a solid communication and innovation strategy, these groups can be important providers of competitive advantage, improving profitability and reducing costs.

References

1. Alinasab, J., Mirahmadi, S.M.R., Ghorbani, H., Caputo, F. (2022). Discovering knowledge and cognitive-based drivers for SMEs internationalization. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 13 (3), 2490-2518. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-021-00801-1>.
2. Argote L., Miron-Spektor, E., (2011). Organizational learning: From experience to knowledge. *Organization Science*, *INFORMS*, 22(5), 1123-1137, October. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0621>.
3. Barham, M. Dabic, T. Daim, D., Shifrer, J. (2020). The role of management support for the implementation of open innovation practices in firms. *Technol. Soc.*, 63, 101282.
4. Belso-Martínez, J.A., Expósito-Langa, M., Tomás-Miquel, J.V. (2016). Knowledge network dynamics in clusters: Past performance and absorptive capacity. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 11(3), 310-327. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-02-2015-0044>.
5. Bratianu, C. (2022). *Knowledge strategies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
6. Bratianu, C., Bejinaru, R. (2019). The theory of knowledge fields: a thermodynamics approach. *Systems*, 7, 20. 10.3390/systems7020020.
7. Bratianu, C., Bejinaru, R. (2023). From knowledge to wisdom: Looking beyond the knowledge hierarchy. *Knowledge*, 3(2), 196-214. <https://doi.org/10.3390/knowledge/3020014>.
8. Bratianu, C., Agapie, A., Orzea, I., Agoston, S. (2011). Inter-generational learning dynamics in universities. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(1), 10-18.
9. Bratianu, C., Nestian, A.S., Tita, S.M., Voda, A.I., Guta, A.L. (2020). The impact of knowledge risk on sustainability of firms. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 22(55), 639-652. <https://doi.org/10.24818/EA/2020/55/639>.
10. Bresciani, S., Ferraris, A. (2016). Innovation-receiving subsidiaries and dual embeddedness: impact on business performance. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 11(1), 108-130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-11-2014-0200>.
11. Chesbrough, H. (2003). The era of open innovation. *Sloan Management Review*, 44(3) 35-41.
12. Chesbrough, H. (2006). *Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*, Harvard Business Press, Boston, MA.
13. Chesbrough H., Crowther, A. K. (2006). Beyond high tech: Early adopters of open innovation in other industries. *R&D Management*, 36(3), 229-236.
14. Cohen, W., Levinthal, D. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 128-152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2393553>.
15. De Zubielqui, G. C., Fryges, H., Jones, J. (2019). Social media, open innovation & HRM: Implications for performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 144, 334-347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.07.014>.
16. Del Giudice, M., Della Peruta, M.R., Maggioni, V. (2015). A model for the diffusion of knowledge sharing technologies inside private transport companies. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19(3), 611-625. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-02-2015-0047>.
17. Del Giudice, M., Garcia-Perez, A., Scuotto, V., Orlando, B. (2019), Are social enterprises technologically innovative? A quantitative analysis on social entrepreneurs in emerging countries. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 148, 119704. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.07.010>.

18. Edvardsson, B., Kristensson, P., Magnusson, P., Sundström, E. (2012). Customer integration within service development– a review of methods and an analysis of insitu and exsitu contribution. *Technovation*, 32(7), 419-429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.04.006>
19. Enkel, E., Gassmann, O., Chesbrough, H. (2009). Special issue: Open R&D and open innovation, Edited by Ellen Enkel, Oliver Gassmann, and Henry Chesbrough September, 311-316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2009.00570.x>.
20. Füller, J., Hutter, K., Faullant, R. (2011). Why co-creation experience matter? Creative experience and its impact on the quantity and quality of creative contributions. *R&D Management*, 41(3) 259-273. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2011.00640.x>.
21. Henkel, J., Von Hippel, E. (2004), Welfare implications of user innovation. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 30 (1/2), 73-87.
22. Huizingh, E.K.R.E. (2011). Open innovation: State of the art and future perspectives. *Technovation*, 31(1), 2-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2010.10.002>.
23. Kaplan, A.M., Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>.
24. Kijkuit, B., Ende, J. V. D. (2010). With a little help from our colleagues: A longitudinal study of social networks for innovation. *Organizational Studies*, 31, 451-79, 2010.
25. Leonardi, P.M. (2014). Social media, knowledge sharing, and innovation: Toward a theory of communication visibility. *Information Systems Research*, 25(4), 796–816. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2014.0536>.
26. Lifshitz-Assaf, M.L. Tushman, K.R., Lakhani, J. (2018) A study of NASA scientists shows how to overcome barriers to open innovation, *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2018/05/why-do-open-innovation-efforts-fail-scientists-want-to-solve-problems-themselves>
27. Majchrzak, A., Faraj, S., Kane, G.C., Azad, B. (2013). The contradictory influence of social media affordances on online communal knowledge sharing. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(1), 38-55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12030>.
28. McAfee, A.P. (2006). Enterprise 2.0: the dawn of emergent collaboration. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(3), 21-28.
29. Murray, A., Papa, A., Cuzzo, B., Russo, G. (2016). Evaluating the innovation of the Internet of things: empirical evidence from the intellectual capital assessment, *Business Process Management Journal*, 22(2), 341-356. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-05-2015-0077>
30. Nonaka, I. (1994) A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5, 14-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14>.
31. Ooms, W., Bell, J., Kok, R. A. W. (2015). Use of social media in inbound open innovation: Building capabilities for absorptive capacity. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 24(1), 136-150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12105>.
32. Ortega-Gutiérrez, J., Cepeda-Carrión, I., Alves, H. (2021). The role of absorptive capacity and organizational unlearning in the link between social media and service-dominant orientation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 26(4), 920-942. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jkm-06-2020-0487>
33. Papa, A., Santoro, G., Tirabeni, L., Monge, F. (2018). Social media as a tool for facilitating knowledge creation and innovation in small and medium enterprises. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 13(3), 329-344. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-04-2017-0125>.

34. Pedrosa, A., Välling, M., Boyd, B. (2013). Knowledge related activities in open innovation: managers' characteristics and practices. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 61 (3/4), 254-273. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTM.2013.052670>
35. Pérez-González, D., Trigueros-Preciado, S., Popa, S. (2017). Social media technologies' use for competitive information and knowledge sharing, and its effects on industrial SMEs' innovation. *Information Systems Management*, 34(3), 291-301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2017.1330007>
36. Rangus, K., Drnovšek, M., Minin, A.D., et al. (2017). The role of open innovation and absorptive capacity in innovation performance: Empirical evidence from Slovenia. *Journal of East European Management Studies*. 22(1), 39- 62. 10.5771/0949-6181-2017-1-39
37. Roser, T., Samson, A., Humphreys, P., Cruz-Valdivieso, E. (2009). New pathways to value: Co-creating products by collaborating with customers. *LSE Enterprise*, London.
38. Salge, T.O., T. Farchi, M. I., Barrett, T., Dopson, S. (2013). When does search openness really matter? A contingency study of health-care innovation projects. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*. 30 (4): 659-676.
39. Schuhbert, A., Thees, H., Pechlaner, H. (2023). Deep and organizational learning as innovation catalyzer in digital business ecosystems—a scenario analysis on the tourism destination Berlin. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-08-2022-0448>
40. Scuotto, V., Beatrice, O., Valentina, C., Nicotra, M., Di Gioia, L., Briamonte, M.F. (2020). Uncovering the micro-foundations of knowledge sharing in open innovation partnerships: an intention-based perspective of technology transfer. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 152, 119906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119906>
41. Sun, Y., Wang, C., Jeyaraj, A. (2020). Enterprise social media affordances as enablers of knowledge transfer and creative performance: an empirical study, *Telematics and Informatics*, 51, 101402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2020.101402>
42. Treem, J.W., Leonardi, P.M. (2012). Social media use in organizations: exploring the affordances of visibility, editability, persistence, and association, *Communication Yearbook*, 36(1), 143-189. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2129853>
43. Xiong, C., Chang, V., Scuotto, V., Shi, Y., Paoloni, N. (2021). The social-psychological approach in understanding knowledge hiding within international R&D teams: an inductive analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 128, 799-811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.009>
44. West, A. Salter, W. Vanhaverbeke, H., Chesbrough, T. (2014). Open innovation: the next decade, *Res. Pol.*, 43, 805-811
45. Yang, H.D., Mason, R.M., Chaudhury, H. (2001). The Internet, value chain visibility, and learning, *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 6(1), 101-120. 10.1109/HICSS.1998.654754
46. Zahra, S., George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 185-203. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4134351>