

transformation agenda.

My thinking

This reinforces the idea that AI is often framed within a larger narrative of digital transformation. At the organisational level, this may blur the line between real and symbolic adoption.

Question

If digitalisation is linked to upgrading at the macro level, how much of this effect reflects real capability change at the organisational level?

AI adoption Patterns

Date. 19/04

Alavi and Leidner (2001)

Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. MIS Quarterly.

Quarterly.

Core Argument

Alavi and Leidner argue that knowledge management systems are not simply information storage tools. Their value depends on how they support knowledge creation, storage, retrieval, transfer, and application within organisational routines. (PP110-118)

Strong claim

The strongest claim is that knowledge systems only matter when they are embedded in organisational processes. This is useful for 2.5.2 "AI adoption Patterns in Chinese Companies", because it supports the idea that AI should not be treated as a separate tool, but as something integrated into everyday practice.

Weakness

The article was written before generative AI and ~~difficult~~ cannot explain AI-specific issues as algorithmic outputs, prompt-based articulation, and machine-generated knowledge. It has limitation on AI-mediated knowledge work.

Relevance to my research:

It helps to justify that AI adoption in Chinese technology firms should be examined through actual work routines, not just system availability.

How this changes my thinking:

It makes more cautions about saying "AI adoption" as if implementation equals use. A firm may introduce an AI knowledge platform, but unless it becomes part of everyday routines, it may remain superficial.

Question:

If AI tools integrated into existing work-flow, do they reshape knowledge practices, or do they simply automate existing power structure?

Duan et al. (2019)

Artificial Intelligence for decision making in the era of big data. International Journal of Information Management.

Core Argument

The authors argue that AI can support decision-making by processing large-scale data, but successful implementation depends on data quality, organisational readiness, and user trust.

Strongest Claim.

The strongest claim is that AI implementation is not only a technical issue. It also depends on organisational conditions such as trust, readiness, and fit with existing decision processes.

Weakness

The paper is broad and decision-making focused. It doesn't deeply examine knowledge sharing, Chinese organisational culture,

hierarchy, or guanxi. It helps explain AI adoption generally but not the cultural mechanisms behind uneven usage.

Relevance.

This supports the AI adoption may vary across teams and functions, even when the technology is technically available.

My thinking

It helps me separate "availability" from "embedded use." AI tools can exist in the organisation, but employees may not trust them, or avoid using them when outputs create accountability risks.

Questions.

If AI depends on trust and organisational readiness, what happens in high power distance firms where employees may use the systems because they are told to, rather than because they trust it?

Pan et al (2020)

Towards a new generation of artificial intelligence in China

Core Argument

The article outlines the development of China's national AI strategy and explain how AI has been positioned as part of wider economic and industrial transformation. The authors argue that AI development in China is strongly connected to state planning, large technology firms, and national innovation goals. AI is presented not only as a technical field, but also a driver of industrial upgrading and digital transformation.

Relevance

It helps explain why AI adoption in Chinese technology firms is often policy-driven rather than based only on operational needs. This is relevant to my discussion of how AI-enabled knowledge sharing systems are introduced within broader organisational and policy pressures.

Date.

Strong Claim.

The article strongly links AI development in China to state coordination and long-term strategic planning.

Weak Claim.

The authors mainly focuses on national strategy and industrial development, with limited discussion of how AI systems are experienced inside organisations or how employees respond to them in practice.

Question.

If AI adoption is strongly shaped by policy alignment, does it encourage symbolic implementation inside firms?

My thinking

This paper examines the policy environment of AI adoption in China. However, my research is more concerned with how AI-enabled systems are interpreted and used inside organisations, especially in relation to knowledge sharing practices and culture.
organisational

Implementation Challenges

Date 24/04

Benlian et al (2022)

Algorithmic management: Bright and dark side, practical implications, and research opportunities.

Core Argument

Benlian et al. argue that algorithmic management can improve coordination and decision support, but it also creates risks around control, surveillance, transparency, and autonomy.
(PP 826-833)

Strong Claim.

The strongest claim is that algorithmic systems do not simply support management; they can reshape control relations inside organisations.

Weak Claim.

The paper is not focused specifically on Chinese firms or knowledge management. It is useful for understanding algorithmic control, but it doesn't explain how hierarchy, guanxi, or face concerns affect employee responses.

Relevance.

This supports the first challenge: AI-enabled transparency can clash with hierarchical authority and existing control over knowledge access. ^(in 2.5.3)

My thinking

It helps me seeing AI-enabled knowledge systems as governance systems, not only as knowledge-sharing platforms. If a system records, ranks and surfaces knowledge, it may also increase surveillance and caution.

Tension/Question.

If AI makes knowledge work more transparent, does it improve knowledge sharing, or does it make employees more careful, compliant, and selective?

28/04

Liu et al. (2025)

Managing knowledge hiding behaviors in Chinese enterprise.

The mediating effects of power dynamics losses.

Core Argument.

Liu et al. argue that when employees ~~per~~ perceive their knowledge as valuable, they may fear losing knowledge-based power if they share it. This perceived loss of knowledge power can lead to knowledge hiding.

Strongest claim:

The strongest claim is that knowledge hiding is linked to power loss, not only to lack of willingness or poor communication.

Weakest evidence.

The study relies on questionnaire data. This is useful for identifying relationships, but weaker for showing how hiding happens in everyday organisational practice. It may also understate hidden or socially sensitive.

Relevance.

This is highly relevant to "implementation challenges" section because it supports the argument that AI transparency may intensify fear of losing knowledge-based advantage.

How this changes my thinking.

It helps me connect knowledge hiding directly to power distance and AI visibility. If AI makes expertise more transferable, some employees may protect knowledge more carefully.

Question.

If AI reduces the technical cost of sharing knowledge, does it increase the political cost of losing knowledge-based power?

Gaps:

Date. 01/05

Nakash and Bolisani (2024)

Knowledge management meets artificial intelligence: A systematic review and future research agenda.

Core Argument.

Nakash and Bolisani argue that most AI-KM research remains heavily technology-oriented and focuses primarily on system capabilities, performance improvement, automation, and implementation outcomes. The review suggests that relatively little attention has been given to AI-mediated knowledge processes. (PP 593-598)

Strongest Claim.

The AI-KM research has developed unevenly with strong emphasis on technical and functional issues, but limited engagement with how AI reshapes knowledge practices inside the organisations.

Weakest evidence.

It remains relatively broad and descriptive, yet offers limited critical engagement with organisational power, hierarchy, or

20/10
cultural context. Chinese organisational environments are almost absent from the discussion.

Relevance

The paper is directly helping justify the claim that AI-KM literature is dominated by positivist and technology-centred approaches. It strengthens the rationale for adopting an interpretivist perspective focused on lived organisational practice.

My Thinking

It makes me more aware that much AI-KM research assumes that technological improvement naturally leads to better knowledge outcomes. AI may improve visibility and access to information while simultaneously changing what employees are willing to articulate or share.

Question

If AI-KM research focuses mainly on measurable outcomes such as efficiency and system use, what important organisational processes become invisible or ignored?

Taherdoost & Madanchian (2023)

Artificial Intelligence and knowledge management: A

comprehensive review of current trends and future directions.

Core Argument

T&M argue that AI technologies are increasingly integrated into knowledge management systems to improve efficiency, automation, prediction, and organisational decision-making.

The AI presents as an important driver of digital transformation within knowledge-intensive organisations. (PP3-9)

Strongest Claim

The strongest claim is that AI has the potential to reshape organisational knowledge processes by increasing the speed, scale, and accessibility of knowledge operations. This is useful because it shows why AI adoption has become strategically important across organisations. (PP5-7)

Weakest Evidence

The paper largely treats AI as a technical and functional solution. It pays limited attention to organisational politics, interpretive ambiguity, or cultural variation.

Relevance

The paper helps establish the dominant orientation of existing AI-KM literature, particularly its tendency to frame AI as a technical optimisation tool rather than a socially situated organisational phenomenon.

My Thinking

The increased efficiency of AI adoption doesn't necessarily mean increased openness, trust, or learning. Organisational behaviour may become more cautious as visibility increases.

Question

If AI increases the efficiency of knowledge systems, does it also unintentionally increase pressure toward standardised and "safe" forms of knowledge articulation.

Tsui (2006)Contextualization in Chinese management researchManagement and Organization ReviewCore Argument

Tsui argues that management research has heavily on universalist assumptions derived largely from Western organisational contexts. She reveals that Chinese organisational environments require greater contextual sensitivity because cultural, institutional and relational conditions fundamentally shape organisational behaviour. (PP 1-10)

Strongest Claim

The strongest claim is that context is not simply an external variable added onto theory. Context shapes the meaning and operations of organisational processes themselves. It's very important because it supports that Chinese organisational culture can't be treated as a superficial "cultural layer".

Weakest Evidence

The paper provides a strong concept argument for contextualisation, but it remains largely programmatic rather than empirically practices. It doesn't explain clearly about how researchers operate it in specific studies.

Relevance

It provides strong justifications for studying AI-mediated knowledge practices within Chinese organisational settings rather than assuming that Western AI-KM findings transfer directly across contexts.

My thinking

This article shifts my understanding of culture, I see guanxi and hierarchy as part of the condition that shape whether knowledge can be articulated, trusted, and transferred.

Question

Can AI systems support knowledge sharing equally well in different organisational and cultural contexts?

Tsui (2007)

From Homogenization to Pluralism: International Management Research in the Academy and Beyond.

Core Argument

Management research has been dominated by theories developed in Western contexts. Tsui argues that the field should move towards greater pluralism and greater attention to local contexts in theory development. (PP 1356-1357).

Strongest Claim

The continued dominance of Western-derived limits the development of management knowledge that reflects diverse organisational realities. (PP 1357-1361)

Weakest Claim

The discussion is largely conceptual and provides limited insight into how context shapes everyday organisational practices.

My Thinking

The paper reminds me that culture and organisational context cannot be treated as background factors. It also supports my decision to combine SECI with power distance and guanxi when examining AI-enabled knowledge sharing in Chinese technology firms.

Question.

How much adaptation is needed when applying established knowledge management theories, such as SECI, in a Chinese organisational context?

Mayer (2006)

Asian management research needs more self-confidence.

Asia Pacific Journal of Management.

Core Argument

Meyer argues that Asian management research has often positioned itself in relation to western theories rather than developing independent conceptual contributions rooted in Asian organisational realities. (PP. 120-128)

Strongest Claim.

The Asian management research shouldn't limit itself to testing Western theories in Asian contexts. Instead, it should generate theoretically meaningful insights from local organisational conditions. (PP. 123-126)

Weakest Evidence.

The research offers a strong intellectual position but limited empirical illustration of how indigenous theorising can be

practically developed in organisational studies.

Relevance

It doesn't treat Chinese organisational culture merely as a setting for AI adoption. Instead, Chinese organisational conditions become analytically important for understanding AI-mediated knowledge work itself.

My Thinking

It makes me more confident about positioning my study as theoretically meaningful rather than merely context-specific. Chinese organisational realities may not simply modify existing AI-KM theories; they may expose assumptions within those theories.

Question

If AI-KM frameworks are largely developed in Western organisational contexts, what forms of knowledge practice become overlooked when these frameworks are applied to Chinese companies?

Jia. et al (2012)

Chinese context and theoretical contributions to management and organization research: A three-decade review.

Core Argument

The argue that although ~~management research~~ management research on Chinese organisations has expanded significantly in three decades, much of it still relies heavily on Western theoretical frameworks without fully engaging with organisational realities.

Strongest Claim (PP 175-179)

Many studies use Chinese organisations mainly as empirical sites for testing existing Western theories rather than generating new conceptual insights from Chinese contexts themselves. (PP 180-186)

Weakest Claim

The review is broad and retrospective. While it effectively identifies patterns across the field, it does not focus specifically on AI, digital technologies, or knowledge management.

Relevance.

It strongly supports the culturally contextualised; interpretivist studies of AI-mediated knowledge practices in Chinese organisations remain underdeveloped.

My Thinking.

It makes me to think more carefully about theoretical contribution. The "SECI" or AI-KM theories cannot be simply applied to Chinese firms. It should also examine where these frameworks become limited or unstable in Chinese organisational contexts.

Question.

Do existing AI-KM theories fully explain knowledge sharing in Chinese organisations?