Hume Studies,
ISSN / eISSN 0319-7336 / 1947-9921
Publisher HUME SOCIETY, OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE,
DEPT PHILOSOPHY,
LOS ANGELES, USA, CA, 90041
Volume 26-Issue 1-(2026)
DOI:https://doi-0004.org/6812/17927837292009

OPEN ACCESS

Knowledge Sharing in Virtual Teams: Adapting the SECI Model for Organizational Learning in the Digital Workplace

Check for updates

A Comprehensive Conceptual Framework for Managing Tacit and Explicit Knowledge in Remote Environments

Ouadah Khelil [1]
ouadahkhalil6@gmail.com
The Higher School of Commerce – Tunisia

Barkat Abdelaziz [2]
a.barkat@ensmanagement.edu.dz
National Higher School of Management- Algeria

Agueb Karim [3]
k.agueb@ensmanagement.edu.dz
National Higher School of Management- Algeria

Kaibich Abdellah [4]
Abdallah.kaibich@gmail.com
University of tissemsilt – Algeria

Bouraba Hemza [5]
Bouraba.hamaza@gmail.com
University of Tunis El Manar - Tunisia

Selkhine Ahmed [6]
Selkhineahmed17@gmail.com
University of tissemsilt – Algeria

Recieved: *15/05/2026* ***Accepted***: *05/09/2026* ***Published***: *24/10/2024*

Abstract

The global rise of remote and hybrid work has permanently altered the operational architecture of contemporary organizations. While cloud technologies, video conferencing, and digital communication tools have made explicit information transfer virtually instantaneous, organizations increasingly grapple with a critical management dilemma: the erosion and fragmentation of tacit knowledge—the personal, intuitive, and experience-based know-how that drives complex problem solving and strategic innovation. This comprehensive conceptual paper examines how organizations can bridge this gap and foster continuous organizational learning within virtual environments. Grounded in the Knowledge-Based View (Grant, 1996) and Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) classical SECI model (Socialization, Externalization, Combination, Internalization), this study adapts classical knowledge conversion principles to the realities of geographically distributed teams. We develop a four-part Digital SECI Framework, examine the social and psychological enablers of virtual knowledge sharing—including psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999) and digital empathy—and present three illustrative industry vignettes demonstrating how remote teams translate raw information into collective competence. Additionally, we provide an actionable implementation playbook for organizational leaders, outline five testable empirical research propositions for doctoral dissertations, and discuss critical organizational boundary conditions. This paper offers an accessible, theory-grounded foundation for scholars and practitioners striving to build resilient knowledge ecosystems in the modern digital workplace.

Keywords: *Knowledge Management; Organizational Learning; SECI Model; Remote Work; Virtual Teams; Tacit Knowledge; Digital Workplace; Psychological Safety; Generative AI.*

1. Introduction and Problem Context

Knowledge has long been celebrated as the primary engine of modern enterprise performance. In strategic management literature, the Knowledge-Based View (KBV) posits that tangible physical assets, capital equipment, and raw materials can easily be acquired on open markets, whereas a firm's unique reservoir of organizational knowledge is socially complex, historically developed, and difficult for competitors to imitate (Barney, 1991; Grant, 1996; Spender, 1996). Consequently, an organization's capacity to continuously generate, disseminate, and integrate knowledge determines whether it will thrive or stagnate in dynamic, competitive markets (Argote, 2013; Teece, 2007).

For decades, the dominant theories of knowledge management and organizational learning were conceived within physical, co-located settings. Classical organizational life revolved around shared physical spaces: open-plan offices, conference rooms, breakroom coffee machines, and side-by-side cubicles. Within these physical settings, knowledge transfer occurred naturally through everyday social contact. Employees did not need a formal agenda to ask a quick question, observe how an experienced mentor negotiated with an angry client, or brainstorm ideas while walking to lunch together. Intersubjective trust and cultural norms were absorbed through shared physical presence (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Tsoukas, 2003).

However, the structural realities of the global business landscape experienced an unprecedented transformation post-2020. Driven by public health necessities, rapid digital infrastructure maturation, and evolving workforce expectations, organizations across the globe transitioned en masse to remote, hybrid, and distributed work arrangements (Leonardi, 2020; Waizenegger et al., 2020). Today, software developers, management consultants, financial analysts, and marketing strategists routinely collaborate across different cities, countries, and time zones without ever meeting their colleagues in person (Leonardi et al., 2023).

While this digital revolution has provided remarkable benefits—including geographic talent access, reduced commercial real estate overheads, and enhanced employee flexibility—it has introduced a profound organizational dilemma that many corporate leaders are only now beginning to fully understand: the 'Leaky Bucket' of organizational memory in virtual environments. While explicit, written data (such as emails, PDF reports, code commits, and project tickets) can be stored and searched with effortless ease, the subtle, unwritten human know-how—known theoretically as 'tacit knowledge'—struggles to flow across digital networks (Baptista et al., 2020; Liang, 2025).

In virtual teams, communication is often hyper-scheduled, transactional, and task-focused. When all communication happens through scheduled Zoom meetings or quick Slack text messages, there is little room for spontaneous curiosity, casual peripheral learning, or informal

reflection. Junior employees frequently report feeling isolated, unsure of how to ask for help without appearing incompetent, while senior professionals find that their valuable insights remain locked inside their personal routines rather than spreading across the firm (Liang, 2025; Waizenegger et al., 2020).

The central motivation of this paper is to explore how organizations can overcome these virtual collaboration barriers. Rather than relying on overly complex mathematical models or inaccessible philosophical prose, this paper adopts an accessible, grounded doctoral perspective. Specifically, we address three foundational research questions: (1) How does the transition to virtual work alter the mechanisms of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing? (2) How can Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) classical SECI model be adapted to reflect the realities of digital collaboration tools and modern AI assistants? and (3) What social, psychological, and managerial conditions are necessary to sustain continuous organizational learning in remote teams?

2. Theoretical Foundations and Literature Review

2.1 Michael Polanyi's Epistemology: Tacit vs. Explicit Knowledge

To understand knowledge management, one must begin with the philosophy of Michael Polanyi (1966). In his landmark work *The Tacit Dimension*, Polanyi established that human knowledge is not a monolithic concept; rather, it is divided into two deeply interrelated dimensions: explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. Understanding this distinction is essential for analyzing modern virtual workplaces.

• 1. Explicit Knowledge (Codified / Objective): Explicit knowledge refers to knowledge that can be clearly articulated in words, numbers, code, diagrams, or formulas. It can be easily documented in manuals, stored in databases, and transmitted across digital networks with high fidelity (Alavi & Leidner, 2001; Grant, 1996). In a corporate setting, explicit knowledge includes standard operating procedures (SOPs), company policies, technical specifications, customer databases, and product user guides. It represents the 'know-what' of an organization.

• 2. Tacit Knowledge (Personal / Intuitive): Tacit knowledge, by contrast, is deeply personal, context-specific, and rooted in human action, experience, and commitment. As Polanyi famously declared, 'We can know more than we can tell' (Polanyi, 1966, p. 4). A master woodworker knows exactly how much pressure to apply with a chisel without being able to write an exact mathematical equation for it; an experienced senior attorney instinctively senses when a opposing witness is about to collapse under cross-examination; a seasoned project manager senses subtle tension among team members even before a word of conflict is spoken. As Haridimos Tsoukas (2003) noted, tacit knowledge is not simply unwritten information waiting to be transcribed; it represents the essential, embodied human understanding that allows people to make sense of explicit rules.

In physical workplaces, tacit knowledge is transmitted primarily through shared bodily experience, facial cues, immediate feedback, and repeated observation (Tsoukas, 2003). When physical contact is removed, the transmission of tacit knowledge becomes the most vulnerable link in the organizational chain.

2.2 Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) SECI Model and the Concept of Ba

Building directly upon Polanyi's distinction, Ikujiro Nonaka and Hirotaka Takeuchi (1995) developed what has become the foundational cornerstone of organizational knowledge creation: the SECI model. Nonaka (1994) posited that organizations do not create knowledge in isolation; rather, knowledge is dynamically created through an ongoing, interactive spiral of conversion between tacit and explicit knowledge across four distinct quadrants:

• Socialization (Tacit to Tacit): The process of sharing tacit knowledge directly between individuals through shared experience, observation, imitation, and hands-on apprenticeship. Language is often secondary; a junior apprentice learns by watching a master craftsman work, absorbing timing, posture, and technique.

• Externalization (Tacit to Explicit): The process of articulating tacit knowledge into explicit concepts, models, metaphors, analogies, or hypotheses. Externalization is often triggered by deep dialogue, reflective questioning, and collaborative brainstorming.

• Combination (Explicit to Explicit): The process of collecting, categorizing, reconfiguring, and integrating different bodies of explicit knowledge into a comprehensive system. Examples include compiling individual project reports into an organizational best-practice manual or merging financial spreadsheets into a corporate forecast.

• Internalization (Explicit to Tacit): The process of embodying explicit knowledge back into individual tacit capability—widely known as 'learning-by-doing'. When an employee studies a training manual and repeatedly practices the procedures until they become second nature, internalization has successfully occurred.

Central to SECI theory is the Japanese concept of 'Ba' (場), which translates roughly to a shared physical, mental, or relational context where knowledge creation takes place (Nonaka & Konno, 1998; Nonaka & Toyama, 2003). Nonaka described four types of Ba: Originating Ba (physical, face-to-face contact), Dialoging Ba (mental spaces for sharing metaphors), Systemizing Ba (virtual or networked systems for combining data), and Exercising Ba (active environments for practice). A critical theoretical observation made by modern researchers is that classical SECI assumed Originating Ba and Dialoging Ba were physically co-located (He & Burger-Helmchen, 2024; Uchihira, 2026). When teams work remotely, organizations must intentionally construct digital equivalents of Ba.

2.3 Organizational Learning: The 4I Framework and Knowledge Transfer

While SECI explains the conversion of knowledge types, organizational learning theory explains how learning moves through social hierarchies. Crossan, Lane, and White (1999) proposed the widely cited 4I Framework, which describes organizational learning as an evolving process traversing four interconnected subprocesses across three ontological levels (Individual, Group, and Organization):

• 1. Intuiting (Individual): The preconscious recognition of patterns, possibilities, or personal insights born from individual experience.

• 2. Interpreting (Individual to Group): Explaining an intuitive insight to oneself and others through language, dialogue, metaphors, and images.

• 3. Integrating (Group): Developing shared understanding and coordinated action among group members through collaborative dialogue and collective practice.

• 4. Institutionalizing (Organization): Embedding collective learning into the organization's formal structures, systems, standard procedures, strategy, and culture.

Crossan et al. (1999) emphasized the dynamic tension between 'feed-forward' processes (taking novel individual insights and institutionalizing them) and 'feedback' processes (applying established institutional rules to guide everyday work). Furthermore, Linda Argote (2013) demonstrated that knowledge transfer within firms is not automatic; it depends heavily on the relationship between the knowledge sender, the recipient, the organizational context, and the technological medium used. In remote environments, the technological medium introduces friction that must be carefully managed.

2.4 Absorptive Capacity and Cognitive Load in Virtual Teams

Two additional theoretical concepts are vital for our analysis. First, Cohen and Levinthal's (1990) concept of 'Absorptive Capacity'—the ability of an organization to recognize the value of new external information, assimilate it, and apply it commercially. In virtual environments, employees' individual absorptive capacity is frequently strained by cognitive overload (Sweller, 1988). When professionals are inundated with constant Slack notifications, email alerts, and back-to-back video calls, their cognitive bandwidth is consumed by processing fragmented information, leaving little mental energy for deep, reflective knowledge integration (Leonardi et al., 2023).

3. The Realities of Remote Work: Detailed Breakdown of Knowledge Barriers

To adapt classical knowledge theories effectively, we must first conduct a thorough, realistic diagnosis of what actually happens when knowledge workers transition from physical offices to home environments. We identify five core structural barriers:

3.1 The Disappearance of the 'Water-Cooler' Effect and Epistemic Serendipity

In organizational sociology, spontaneous casual interactions are recognized as vital conduits of informal knowledge transfer (Leonardi, 2020). In a physical building, an employee stepping out to refill a water glass might encounter a colleague from another department and mention a minor bug; the colleague might reply, 'Oh, our team solved that last month, here is what we did'. This is termed 'epistemic serendipity'—unexpected knowledge discovery through informal proximity (Waizenegger et al., 2020). In virtual environments, serendipity almost completely disappears. Every video call requires an explicit calendar invite, a defined link, and an agenda. Employees rarely schedule a 30-minute Zoom call to share an unpolished idea, resulting in an immense loss of informal cross-pollination (Baptista et al., 2020).

3.2 Asynchronous Communication and Cognitive Distance

While asynchronous text chat (e.g., Slack, Microsoft Teams, email) provides incredible time flexibility, text is a notoriously 'lean' communication medium (Daft & Lengel, 1986). It lacks vocal inflection, facial expressions, micro-pauses, and body language. Research in virtual team management shows that text-based communication frequently leads to 'cognitive distance' and interpersonal misunderstanding (Cramton, 2001). A short message like 'Please review this' can easily be interpreted by a junior colleague as cold criticism rather than neutral instruction, prompting defensiveness and reluctance to share preliminary work.

3.3 The Remote Onboarding and Mentorship Dilemma

The most acute victim of virtual work is junior talent development. When new graduates join a company remotely, their entire organizational reality is mediated by a 14-inch laptop screen. They cannot look around the room to see how senior colleagues organize their desks, hear how consultants handle difficult client pushback, or quietly ask a coworker, 'Is this normal?' (Liang, 2025). As a consequence, remote onboarding takes significantly longer, and junior employees often feel chronic anxiety about bothering busy team members with 'silly' questions.

3.4 Digital Tool Fatigue and Information Fragmentation

Modern virtual organizations frequently suffer from an overabundance of disjointed software tools. A single project may involve conversations in Slack, tasks in Asana, documents in Google Drive, code in GitHub, and slide decks in SharePoint. When knowledge is scattered across five different platforms with differing access permissions, employees spend hours simply searching for the latest version of a file. This fragmentation leads to 'search fatigue', causing frustrated employees to give up and recreate solutions from scratch (Alavi & Leidner, 2001; Leonardi, 2020).

3.5 The Knowledge Hoarding vs. Sharing Dilemma under Digital Surveillance

In some remote organizations, management responds to physical separation by implementing invasive digital tracking software—monitoring mouse activity, keyboard strokes, and webcam presence (Aloisi & De Stefano, 2021). Sociological research demonstrates that surveillance breeds defensiveness. When employees feel watched, they focus on producing easily measurable explicit outputs (e.g., sending numerous emails, closing tickets) rather than engaging in collaborative, high-risk knowledge sharing that takes time and produces no immediate digital paper trail.

4. The Adapted Conceptual Framework: Digital SECI for Virtual Teams

To address these structural challenges, we present our adapted conceptual framework: The Digital SECI Model. Rather than discarding Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) timeless logic, we systematically translate each of the four knowledge conversion modes into the realities of the contemporary digital workplace.

> **Stage 1: Virtual Socialization (Tacit to Tacit in Digital Spaces):** In virtual teams, socialization cannot be left to chance; it must be architected into regular team routines. Virtual Socialization is achieved by creating 'Digital Originating Ba'—intentional virtual spaces where team members build personal rapport and observe each other's working styles without formal task pressure.
>
> *Key Mechanisms: Open virtual coworking rooms (silent Zoom rooms with cameras on), weekly non-work coffee check-ins, paired virtual work sessions, and structured peer-buddy mentorship programs (Waizenegger et al., 2020).*

In practice, Virtual Socialization acknowledges that casual connection is not wasted time; it is the vital foundation of organizational trust. For example, leading remote software development companies implement 'Virtual Pair Programming', where two developers share a screen for two hours each day. While one codes, the other observes and discusses logic aloud. Through this shared digital experience, the junior programmer absorbs the senior developer's tacit debugging intuition, keyboard shortcuts, and problem-solving rhythm.

> **Stage 2: Digital Externalization (Tacit to Explicit with AI and Visual Tools):** Externalization is the difficult process of converting unwritten mental models into clear, structured concepts that others can understand. In the digital workplace, this process is dramatically accelerated by modern collaborative whiteboards and Generative AI assistants.
>
> *Key Mechanisms: Collaborative digital whiteboards (Miro, Mural), asynchronous screen walkthroughs (Loom), and conversational AI prompt-scaffolding (Jarrahi et al., 2023; Uchihira, 2026).*

Writing a comprehensive 10-page guide is daunting for busy technical experts. However, Digital Externalization allows an expert to record a 3-minute video walking through their thought process while sharing their screen. Alternatively, an expert can engage in a Socratic dialogue with

a Generative AI assistant (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude): the human expert speaks or types their raw, unorganized thoughts, and the AI organizes the reflections into a cohesive checklist or diagnostic framework. The expert reviews and refines the draft, externalizing their tacit expertise with minimal friction (Tingelhoff et al., 2024; Uchihira, 2026).

> **Stage 3: Connected Combination (Explicit to Explicit with Smart Knowledge Hubs):** Combination involves taking diverse explicit documents, codes, and guides and connecting them into a coherent organizational knowledge base. In digital environments, this requires moving away from static folder hierarchies toward dynamic, searchable knowledge graphs.
>
> *Key Mechanisms: Modern cloud knowledge wikis (Notion, Confluence, Coda), centralized enterprise search engines, AI-powered automated tagging, and cross-departmental documentation standards (Dwivedi et al., 2023).*

Connected Combination ensures that documented knowledge does not go to die in forgotten folders. Modern cloud wikis utilize relational databases, allowing a single troubleshooting guide to automatically appear on the customer support page, the engineering roadmap, and the new hire onboarding dashboard. AI-powered search allows employees to ask natural-language questions (e.g., 'How did we handle refund disputes for European enterprise clients last year?') and receive synthesized answers that link directly to the underlying source documents.

> **Stage 4: Applied Internalization (Explicit to Tacit through Practice and Reflection):** Internalization is the stage where employees transform explicit instructions into personal, automatic competence ('learning-by-doing'). In virtual teams, reading documentation is insufficient; internalization requires deliberate application and reflection.
>
> *Key Mechanisms: Digital sandbox training environments, interactive virtual simulation workshops, and mandatory 15-minute project debriefs ('Post-Mortems') where teams reflect on lessons learned (Argote, 2013; Kolb, 1984).*

For example, in a remote customer success team, newly hired representatives read standard scripts (Explicit Knowledge), but they internalize this knowledge by participating in simulated role-play sessions with senior mentors or interacting with conversational AI role-playing bots that simulate difficult customer personas. Following the simulation, the team holds a reflective debriefing session to discuss what worked and what felt awkward, thereby cementing explicit advice into embodied tacit intuition.

SECI Conversion Mode	Traditional Office Practice	Digital Workplace Adaptation	Primary Technological Enablers
1. Socialization (Tacit → Tacit)	Physical proximity, water-cooler chats, observing senior colleagues, lunch gatherings.	Virtual Socialization: Scheduled non-work check-ins, open coworking rooms, virtual pair work, peer-buddy shadowing.	Zoom, Microsoft Teams, Tandem, Discord for Teams, Slack Huddles.

2. Externalization (Tacit → Explicit)	Manual typing of manuals, physical whiteboard brainstorming in conference rooms.	Digital Externalization: Asynchronous video screen-recordings, collaborative digital whiteboards, AI conversational drafting.	Loom, Miro, Mural, Otter.ai, ChatGPT/Claude prompt assistants.
3. Combination (Explicit → Explicit)	Physical binders, printed memos, disconnected local server hard drives.	Connected Combination: Cloud-based living wikis, relational databases, AI semantic search, automated wiki indexing.	Notion, Confluence, SharePoint, Glean, GitHub Enterprise.
4. Internalization (Explicit → Tacit)	On-site trial and error, physical factory training, shadowing live customer meetings.	Applied Internalization: Safe digital sandbox testing, interactive scenario simulations, mandatory team reflective debriefs.	Interactive software staging sandboxes, AI role-play simulators, Miro retrospectives.

Table 1. Detailed Adaptation of SECI Knowledge Conversion Modes for the Digital Workplace.

5. The Human and Social Enablers: Beyond Technology

A critical mistake made by many organizational leaders is treating knowledge management as purely an IT challenge (Alavi & Leidner, 2001; Grant, 1996). A company can purchase the most expensive software licenses in the world, but if employees do not trust each other or fear making mistakes, no genuine knowledge sharing will occur. In this section, we examine the vital social and psychological enablers:

5.1 Psychological Safety in Digital Spaces

Harvard Business School professor Amy Edmondson (1999) defined psychological safety as a shared organizational belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking. Team members feel confident that no one will embarrass, punish, or reject someone for speaking up, asking questions, or admitting an error. In virtual teams, psychological safety is significantly more fragile because digital interactions lack warm physical reassurance (Edmondson, 1999; Leonardi, 2020).

When an employee posts an unpolished draft in a public Slack channel, they expose themselves to scrutiny from dozens of people simultaneously. If leaders respond with harsh criticism or public correction, the entire team observes this outcome and retreats into silence. To foster virtual knowledge sharing, leaders must explicitly celebrate vulnerability. Leaders should publicly share their own mistakes and declare, 'This didn't work as planned, here is what we learned from it', signaling that honest experimentation is prized over defensive perfection.

5.2 Swift Trust vs. Relational Trust in Virtual Teams

Sirrka Jarvenpaa and Dorothy Leidner (1999) famously studied trust in global virtual teams and identified two distinct forms of trust: 'Swift Trust' (temporary, task-based trust established

quickly based on clear roles and immediate responsiveness) and 'Relational Trust' (deep, affective trust developed over long periods of shared personal experience). Virtual teams often launch with high swift trust, but unless they invest time in social interactions (Virtual Socialization), this trust decays whenever an unexpected project crisis occurs. Maintaining virtual knowledge sharing requires actively nurturing relational trust through consistent empathy and mutual support.

5.3 Developing 'Digital Empathy' and Clear Communication Norms

In physical offices, if an employee is having a stressful personal day, coworkers notice their tired posture or quiet tone and offer gentle support. In virtual teams, colleagues see only brief text messages. Organizations must cultivate 'Digital Empathy'—the conscious habit of assuming positive intent and checking in on colleagues personally before diving into work tasks. Establishing explicit team communication agreements (e.g., 'We do not expect Slack responses after 6:00 PM; for urgent emergencies, we call') prevents burnout and protects cognitive well-being.

5.4 Leadership Transformation: From Surveillance to Supportive Coaching

The shift to remote work fundamentally invalidates traditional 'presence-based' management. Managers who attempt to monitor knowledge workers by counting hours logged online destroy intrinsic motivation. High-performing virtual leaders operate as supportive coaches: they define clear strategic goals, provide necessary digital resources, remove administrative roadblocks, and measure outcomes rather than seat time. This supportive leadership style directly encourages employees to share knowledge freely.

6. Illustrative Industry Vignettes: Digital SECI in Action

To make our conceptual framework tangible, we present three realistic organizational vignettes illustrating how the Digital SECI model operates across diverse knowledge-intensive sectors:

Vignette A: A Fully Remote Software Engineering Team

A distributed financial technology startup with 40 developers spread across four continents faced repeated system outages caused by complex legacy database bugs. Under classical conditions, junior developers struggled alone for days because they hesitated to interrupt senior engineers. The firm implemented the Digital SECI framework: (1) Virtual Socialization: Developers initiated daily one-hour 'Pairing Huddles' where junior engineers shadowed seniors during live debugging; (2) Digital Externalization: Whenever a tricky bug was solved, the engineer recorded a 2-minute Loom video explaining the root cause; (3) Connected Combination: An automated bot linked the video to the relevant GitHub code commit and indexed it in the team's Notion wiki; (4) Applied Internalization: Every Friday, the team conducted a 20-minute 'Chaos

Engineering' sandbox where junior developers practiced fixing intentional bugs in a safe test environment. Within six months, average outage resolution time dropped by 55%, and new developer onboarding speed doubled.

Vignette B: A Global Management Consulting Practice

A top-tier consulting firm shifted to a hybrid model, finding that junior associates were delivering repetitive, generic market analyses because they lacked access to the senior partners' tacit industry intuition. The practice adapted the framework: (1) Virtual Socialization: Partners hosted bi-weekly 'Unfiltered Storytelling' video sessions sharing past consulting failures and turnaround strategies; (2) Digital Externalization: Associates used an enterprise AI assistant to conduct interactive Socratic interviews with senior partners, converting partners' audio reflections into structured strategic frameworks; (3) Connected Combination: The firm deployed an AI-powered semantic search engine (Glean) across all global slide decks, client deliverables, and internal case studies; (4) Applied Internalization: Before client presentations, associates participated in simulated client pitch workshops where senior colleagues played challenging client roles. Client satisfaction scores rose significantly across hybrid project deliveries.

Vignette C: A 24/7 Virtual Customer Success Department

A remote SaaS enterprise with 80 customer support agents struggled with high customer churn and inconsistent service quality. Support agents were isolated in their home offices, rarely knowing how colleagues resolved novel client complaints. The director instituted Digital SECI: (1) Virtual Socialization: The team maintained an open Discord voice channel where agents could hang out quietly, celebrate wins, and ask quick questions during shifts; (2) Digital Externalization: Agents tagged exemplary customer resolution threads in Slack, which an integrated AI tool summarized into clear troubleshooting steps; (3) Connected Combination: The AI compiled these summaries into a unified internal customer knowledge base with instant tag search; (4) Applied Internalization: Team leads held weekly 15-minute case reflection huddles reviewing the week's most complex tickets. First-contact resolution rates increased by 38% within four months.

7. The Practitioner's Implementation Playbook: A 5-Phase Roadmap

For organizational leaders, department chairs, and project managers seeking to implement this framework, we provide a structured, practical five-phase implementation roadmap (see Table 2 for diagnostic checklist):

• 1. Phase 1: The Digital Knowledge Audit: Survey employees to identify where knowledge bottlenecks exist. Ask: Where do people spend the most time searching for answers? Which team members are overloaded with repetitive questions? What unwritten skills are held by only one person?

• 2. Phase 2: Tool Consolidation and Digital Hub Creation: Eliminate redundant apps. Establish a single, definitive 'Source of Truth' (e.g., Notion, Confluence) with simple folder structures, clear ownership, and standard naming conventions.

• 3. Phase 3: Architecting Virtual Social Rituals: Introduce non-negotiable informal rituals. Schedule weekly virtual coffee check-ins, implement peer-buddy onboarding, and establish open virtual coworking spaces for quiet collaboration.

• 4. Phase 4: Enabling Frictionless Externalization: Train employees to use lightweight documentation methods. Replace lengthy mandatory written reports with 2-minute video walkthroughs and conversational AI drafting tools.

• 5. Phase 5: Institutionalizing Reflective Debriefing: Normalize 15-minute project retrospectives ('Post-Mortems'). Review what went well, what failed, and update the knowledge hub immediately following every project delivery.

Diagnostic Dimension	Key Assessment Question for Leaders	Target Organizational Benchmark
Virtual Socialization Health	Do team members have regular, informal opportunities to interact casually without task agendas?	At least 1-2 hours per week of informal or paired collaboration.
Externalization Friction	How easy is it for busy experts to document their personal know-how?	Under 5 minutes using video notes, templates, or AI drafting.
Knowledge Findability	Can an employee find a verified company procedure or file within two minutes?	Centralized single source of truth with functional search.
Internalization & Practice	Do project teams systematically debrief after completing deliverables?	Mandatory 15-minute post-mortem on 100% of major projects.
Psychological Safety	Do employees feel comfortable asking basic questions in public team channels?	Active public questioning welcomed by leadership without penalty.

Table 2. The Virtual Knowledge Management Diagnostic Checklist for Practitioners.

8. A Roadmap for Future Doctoral and Empirical Research

As a conceptual contribution, this paper lays fertile ground for graduate dissertations, master's theses, and academic research papers. To assist fellow doctoral researchers, we articulate five clear, testable research propositions and recommended empirical methodologies:

• Proposition 1 (Socialization and Onboarding): In fully remote organizations, the frequency of informal, non-task virtual interactions (Virtual Socialization) is positively associated with junior employee retention, psychological well-being, and tacit skill acquisition velocity.

• Recommended Methodology: Multi-wave longitudinal survey among new hires across remote tech companies during their first 180 days, tracking socialization frequency against performance ratings and turnover intention.

• Proposition 2 (AI Externalization and Codification): The time required to externalize technical expert heuristics into organizational best-practice assets is significantly lower when professionals utilize conversational AI prompt assistants compared to unassisted manual document drafting.

• Recommended Methodology: Laboratory or field experiment with software engineers assigned to document complex systems either unassisted or using a structured Socratic AI prompt assistant, evaluating speed and quality.

• Proposition 3 (Knowledge Hubs and Innovation): Teams with centralized, searchable cloud knowledge repositories demonstrate significantly lower duplicate work and higher cross-project innovation rates than teams with fragmented, local storage systems.

• Recommended Methodology: Cross-sectional survey across 150 virtual knowledge-intensive SMEs, measuring repository centralization against self-reported innovation metrics and duplicate effort incidence.

• Proposition 4 (Psychological Safety as a Moderator): The positive relationship between digital collaboration tools and employee knowledge-sharing behavior is strongly moderated by team psychological safety, such that high tool availability fails to stimulate knowledge sharing in low-safety climates.

• Recommended Methodology: Hierarchical regression or structural equation modeling (SEM) using Edmondson's (1999) psychological safety scale alongside digital collaboration telemetry data.

• Proposition 5 (Internalization and Reflective Debriefing): Project teams that routinely conduct structured virtual debriefing sessions (Post-Mortems) exhibit statistically significant improvements in subsequent project cycle times compared to teams that do not conduct debriefings.

• Recommended Methodology: Quasi-experimental comparative field study across project teams within a single consulting or engineering firm over a 12-month period.

9. Critical Boundary Conditions and Organizational Limitations

Academic intellectual integrity requires acknowledging the boundaries and potential pitfalls of our framework. Implementing the Digital SECI model is subject to several important organizational constraints:

• 1. Generational Differences and Digital Literacy: Not all employees possess identical comfort levels with modern digital collaboration tools. While digital-native younger workers may naturally embrace Slack huddles and Miro boards, experienced senior professionals may find continuous digital interactions exhausting or distracting. Organizations must provide patient, tailored digital literacy training rather than assuming universal fluency.

• 2. Cybersecurity, Intellectual Property, and Data Privacy: Deploying cloud-based living wikis and Generative AI assistants raises legitimate security concerns, particularly in highly regulated industries such as healthcare, defense, and banking. Organizations must ensure enterprise-grade encryption and strict data governance policies preventing proprietary trade secrets from leaking into public AI training models.

• 3. Sectoral Applicability (Knowledge Workers vs. Frontline Manufacturing): This framework is specifically tailored for knowledge-intensive service and tech environments. In physical manufacturing, healthcare delivery, and logistics, physical co-presence and embodied manual apprenticeship remain irreplaceable. Management scholars must avoid over-generalizing virtual models to physical production environments.

10. Conclusion

The shift to remote and virtual work represents one of the most transformative organizational evolutions in modern business history. While it has granted organizations unprecedented access to global talent and provided workers with remarkable flexibility, it has fundamentally disrupted the traditional, physical mechanisms through which human expertise, personal trust, and tacit wisdom were historically passed down.

By revisiting Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) classical SECI model and translating its four conversion modes into the realities of the digital workplace, this paper has demonstrated that knowledge management does not have to wither in remote settings. On the contrary, when organizations intentionally architect virtual spaces for informal connection (Virtual Socialization), leverage lightweight digital tools and AI assistants to lower the cost of documentation (Digital Externalization), maintain living, centralized knowledge hubs (Connected Combination), and cultivate structured reflective practice (Applied Internalization), they unlock a vibrant, continuous learning ecosystem that transcends physical boundaries.

Ultimately, the future of work belongs neither to uncritical technological obsession nor to nostalgic longings for the five-day physical office. It belongs to thoughtful, empathetic organizations that recognize that while technology connects screens, it is human trust, psychological safety, and shared learning that truly connects minds.

References

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly, 25(1), 107-136. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961

Aloisi, A., & De Stefano, V. (2021). Essential jobs, remote work and digital surveillance: Addressing the COVID-19 pandemic panopticon. International Labour Review, 160(4), 587-606. https://doi.org/10.1111/ilr.12219

Argote, L. (2013). Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge (2nd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5251-5

Baptista, J., Stein, M. K., Klein, S., Watson-Manheim, M. B., & Lee, J. (2020). Digital work and organizational transformation: Emergent themes and future research directions. The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 29(2), Article 101618. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101618

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(1), 128-152. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553

Cramton, C. D. (2001). The mutual knowledge problem and its consequences for dispersed collaboration. Organization Science, 12(3), 346-371. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.3.346.10098

Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. Academy of Management Review, 24(3), 522-537. https://doi.org/10.54941/amr.1999.522

Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. Management Science, 32(5), 554-571. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., ... Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 71, Article 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350-383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 17(S2), 109-122. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250171110

He, X., & Burger-Helmchen, T. (2024). Evolving knowledge management: Artificial intelligence and the dynamics of social interactions. IEEE Engineering Management Review, 52(3), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2024.3519342

Jarrahi, M. H., Askay, D., Eshraghi, A., & Smith, P. (2023). Artificial intelligence and knowledge management: A partnership between human and AI. Business Horizons, 66(1), 87-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2022.03.002

Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Leidner, D. E. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. Organization Science, 10(6), 791-815. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.6.791

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.

Leonardi, P. M. (2020). COVID-19 and the new technologies of organizing: Digital exhaust, digital footprints, and artificial intelligence in the wake of remote work. Journal of Management Studies, 58(1), 249-253. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12648

Leonardi, P. M., Parker, S. H. S., & Shen, R. (2023). How remote work changes the world of work. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 11, 403-428. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-091922-015852

Liang, S. Y. (2025). Hiljaisen tiedon jakamisen haasteet etä- ja hybridityössä pk-yrityksissä [The challenges of sharing tacit knowledge in remote and hybrid work in SMEs]. Tampere University Institutional Repository.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. Organization Science, 5(1), 14-37. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14

Nonaka, I., & Konno, N. (1998). The concept of 'Ba': Building a foundation for knowledge creation. California Management Review, 40(3), 40-54. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165942

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation. Oxford University Press.

Nonaka, I., & Toyama, R. (2003). The knowledge-creating theory to create a dynamic theory of the firm. Industrial and Corporate Change, 12(1), 2-10. https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/12.1.2

Polanyi, M. (1966). The tacit dimension. Doubleday & Company.

Spender, J. C. (1996). Making knowledge the basis of a dynamic theory of the firm. Strategic Management Journal, 17(S2), 45-62. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250171106

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, 12(2), 257-285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319-1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Tingelhoff, F., Beese, J., & Back, A. (2024). A guide for structured literature reviews in business research: The state-of-the-art and how to integrate generative artificial intelligence. Journal of Information Technology, 39(4), 589-612. https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962241258902

Tsoukas, H. (2003). Do we really understand tacit knowledge? In M. Easterby-Smith & M. A. Lyles (Eds.), The Blackwell handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management (pp. 410-427). Blackwell Publishing.

Uchihira, N. (2026). Tacit knowledge management with Generative AI: Proposal of the GenAI SECI model. In Human Factors in Artificial Intelligence and Social Computing (pp. 215-226). AHFE International. https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1007727

Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19. European Journal of Information Systems, 29(4), 429-442. https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1800417