KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS AT MALAYSIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES: A REVIEW
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Abstract: The history of KM is evolving. However, it has a long root in library practice in the sense of managing knowledge. The initial appeal of the emerging field was in business. Recently, Knowledge Management (KM) has often been claimed to be an essential ingredient in building competitive within libraries. Yet, KM adoption is relatively slow in evolving especially in the context of Malaysian university libraries. Whereby library management need to have initiatives to take steps and move forward for encouraging their staffs in acknowledging KM. This paper presents a conceptual model/framework that will be developed in the perspective of the Knowledge Management Practice (KMP) at the university libraries environment. This Knowledge Management Practice (KMP) model/framework relies on knowledge processes that exist in a Library and Information Sciences (LIS) environment. The conceptual model/framework emphasizes on the knowledge gaps found, namely as Knowledge Record (KRe) and Knowledge Preserving (KPr) in the current KM Practice framework. Nevertheless, it is hoped that these novel two processes of knowledge gaps could provide a direction for future research and contribute to enrich the literature in KM areas.
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Introduction

The KM changes are evolutionary. Today, an evolving of Knowledge Management Practices in libraries has grown tremendously in research and publication. Number of researchers are trying to focus and solve some of the issues, arising out of current problems exist in their organization. Libraries are adding new process and activities, digital resources and services while maintaining most of the old, traditional resources and services. Why knowledge management practices especially at Malaysian university libraries need to be evolve? We realize that in 21st century, libraries have gone through an evolutionary. However, libraries are still practicing the conventional process, which is to collect, process, disseminate, store and utilize information to provide service to the university community (Daneshgar & Bosanquet, 2010; Feng, Jeusfeld, &
Hoppenbrouwers, 2001; Foo, Chaudhry, Majid, & Logan, 2002; Roknuzzaman & Umemoto, 2009). Whatever influences universities activity also affects the environment of academic libraries operate today. The success of Knowledge management in libraries also depends on their ability to utilize information and knowledge of its staff to better serve of the organization needs. Today, we do what we have to do as a librarian in the library to maintain the library function and relevant in time. We realize that there is a need and demand for new evolutionary of technology in library environment (Feng, et al., 2001).

In recent decades, knowledge management (KM) has been perceived as another potential viable response to the challenges that the LIS profession is facing in a continuously changing environment (Sarrafzadeh, Martin, & Hazeri, 2010). There are numbers of definition related to knowledge management practice in libraries. Tandale, et al. (2011) defines KM is to create a process of valuing the organization’s intangible assets in order to best leverage knowledge internally and externally. Knowledge management, therefore, deals with creating, securing, capturing, coordinating, combining, retrieving, and distributing knowledge. Skyrme and Amidon (1997) defines KM as a “process or practice of creating, acquiring, capturing, sharing, and using knowledge, wherever it resides, to enhance learning and performance in organizations.” Brendan (1999) broadly defined KM as a acquisition, sharing and use of knowledge within organizations, including learning processes and management information systems (MIS) or, more specifically, the explicit and systematic management of vital knowledge associated with processes of creating, gathering, organizing, diffusion, use and exploitation. On a similar note, White (2004) defines KM as “a process of creating, storing, sharing and re-using organizational knowledge (know-how) to enable an organization to achieve its goals and objectives”. In a similar view, KM is seen as distinct from both librarianship and Information Management (IM), as it includes knowledge creation and knowledge sharing, and the interplay of tacit and explicit, individual and collective knowledge (Hammer, Leonard, & Davenport, 2004; B. Martin, Hazeri, & Sarrafzadeh, 2006). However, KM defines as a “process or practice of creating, acquiring, capturing and sharing as depicts in Sand Cone model. Nevertheless, this study proposes two new processes of KM practices which have positive influences on KMP that must be included as shown in Sand Cone Model namely Knowledge Record and Knowledge Preservation in Figure 1.

Figure 1. The Sand Cone Model by M Saffi, Tasmin and Takala (2012)
Knowledge management is a dynamic and cyclical process that involves the whole organizational processes, trying to map the existent learning, linking the essential processes and their strategy, in search of better organizational performance, development of the products and services, quality and client’s management among others (Conklin, 1996; T. H. Davenport & Prusak, 2002; Wiig, 1997). Zack, et al., (2009) and White (2004) hold similar opinions and view knowledge as a strategic resource. Organizations that succeed in knowledge management are likely to view knowledge as an asset and to develop organizational norms and values, which support the creation and sharing of knowledge (Rowley, 1999). It is strategic and action oriented. In the context of this study academic libraries refer to only university libraries.

Wen (2005) states that to prove their relevance and value, academic libraries must strive to provide the right amount of information to the right client at the right time with a right expense of financial and human resources. With a stagnant or dwindling library budget, academic libraries have to increase their operational efficiency in order to meet the challenge. One management tool that can help in this regard is Knowledge Management (KM). Therefore, to implement Knowledge Management Practice in academic libraries is mainly driven by its mission rather than by the competition from Internet-based reference services or electronic books. From the above understanding of definitions, KM is a process of creation, acquisition, capturing, sharing, record and preserving in the library. It is obvious to say that KM does not consist of only tacit knowledge as indicated in some KM literature. It comprises both tacit and explicit knowledge, which are complementary. Jain (2007) state that KM can be characterized as below:

- KM core process of several activities; creating, acquiring, capturing, sharing, using and re-using it;
- It includes both explicit and tacit knowledge;
- It is an ongoing activity;
- Information is the building block of KM;
- It is action oriented or application based; and,
- The main drive behind KM is to improve organizational performance.

As the practice of Knowledge Management (KM) across the world, issues’ concerning knowledge processes in the library has moved to the forefront. The purpose of this paper is to emphasize knowledge gaps namely as Knowledge Record (KRe) and Knowledge Preserving (KPr) in the current theoretical framework. This study found that these considerations of new gaps are critical to the positive reputation of any libraries in the world especially at Malaysian university libraries. Therefore, theoretical framework of Knowledge Record (KRe) and Knowledge Preserving (KPe) hoped could contribute to a body of knowledge especially in Library and Information Sciences (LIS) environment. A body of literature have explored academic library as one of the significant areas where KM practice can actively be applied.

Tacit vs. Explicit

As we notice, library has a lot of collections that they need to manage and offers their services and facilities to their users. It is very subjective to say that library could provide their user satisfaction when dealing or borrowing library materials. In an academic institution, library will remain central to the management of scholarly communication. It fulfills the traditional role of information supply or document delivery (Goswami, 2009). McInerney (2002) stated that knowledge is acquired actively and dynamically through sensory stimulation, listening to and observing others, reading, being aware of feelings, life experience, etc. It is this dynamic nature of knowledge that leads to the question of how something in flux, in movement and action, can be managed. There are two types of knowledge known as Tacit and Explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge is defined variously as that which is gained experientially or, stressing the privacy of personal experience, in terms of its incommunicability (Spender, 1996). Recent studies by Crowley (2001) states that in the business, sociological, psychological, military, and other research literatures have expanded this concise definition to include assertions that tacit knowledge as personal in origin, valuable to the possessor, job specific, related to context, difficult to fully articulate, transmitted, where transmission is possible, through interpersonal contact, operative on an organizational level, etc. However, the
meaning of the explicit depends on its use, on how it is fitted into the complex tacit universe of social or organizational practice (Spender, 1996; Townley, 2001). Townley (2001) state that explicit and tacit knowledge shared in workgroups. As with individuals, this knowledge is subject to loss with the elimination or restructuring of a workgroup. Therefore, Table 1 shows the characteristics of tacit and explicit knowledge produced by McInerney (2002) adaption from Polanyi (1983).

Table 1. Characteristics of tacit and explicit knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit or tacit knowledge</th>
<th>Explicit knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subconscious</td>
<td>Formally articulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td>Elucidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to articulate or unspoken</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced based</td>
<td>Codified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred through conversation</td>
<td>Documented (written, taped, recorded, digitized, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded in stories and narratives</td>
<td>Stored in repositories (databases, files, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapes observation</td>
<td>Can be viewed or heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held within self</td>
<td>Shared with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insights and understandings</td>
<td>Pushed or pulled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgments</td>
<td>Reports, lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source from McInerney (2002)

In a knowledge management program it is the knowledge artifact, or the thing, that is managed, not knowledge itself, and the knowledge representation must reflect the action of knowledge acquisition. For example, if records of the knowledge/lessons that people learn in the course of a project are collected, subtleties of efforts with clients or colleagues must be captured and reported along with a write up of conclusions (McInerney, 2002). In addition, librarians in the library need to focus on the explicit knowledge and managing it to give their user satisfaction when dealing with them. Hence, the explicit knowledge as shown in Figure 2 indicates that library need to record and preserving all materials inside their building.
Nevertheless, having a static collection of knowledge artifacts/collections, codifying them, and placing them in a system is not really enough for knowledge to be used effectively. However, Nonaka (1994) state that the process of dynamic knowledge creation occurs during socialization when internal (tacit) knowledge is made external (explicit). This spiral operates between internal and external knowledge will continually effect new knowledge among workgroups which creates the energy and innovation that characterizes an active knowledge intensive and knowledge creating in the organization such as libraries. It is an active process involving the creation of knowledge, the intentional elicitation of knowledge, and the ability to share knowledge artifacts/collections in organization. See Figure 2 for a graphic representation of a knowledge continuum in university libraries as a whole that illustrates how tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge interact through internal and external processes within and among users/customers. Therefore, this KM processes and practice could give benefits and acknowledgements toward library users’ satisfaction.

**Types of KM Process/Practices**

Information and knowledge is not the same thing at all (Lee, 2005) and it illustrated in Figure 3. With the transformation of knowledge management practice at university libraries, there are several KM practices need to emphasize to demonstrate the significant relation among processes. (Aharony, 2011; Alavi, Kayworth, & Leidner, 2006; Alavi & Leidner, 2001; Gold, Malhotra, & Segars, 2001; Ipe, 2003; Meng & Fei, 2003; Nonaka, Byosiere, Borucki, & Kommo, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1991; Townley, 2001).
Knowledge is composed of the tacit experiences, ideas, insights, values and judgments of individuals as well as for the analysis of information and data. However, it may change direction and bringing more opportunities in libraries to grow or expand (Jawadekar, 2011). The processes of knowledge coupled with understanding and context in LIS urged on how libraries expand the processes in KM such as knowledge creation, knowledge acquisition, knowledge capture, knowledge sharing, knowledge record, knowledge preserving and so forth. Therefore, the question “how” in this stage is reflected to the libraries itself how they manage the growing or expand of knowledge processes inside the building.

**Knowledge Creation (KCr)**

The first practice need to be elaborated is knowledge creation. Maponya (2004) states that knowledge in the context of academic libraries can be created through understanding the user needs and requirements as well as understanding the university’s curricula. Recent trends in education emphasizing collaboration and group study are causing a demand for new resources. The need for “knowledge creation” workspace has encouraged librarians, faculty, and computer specialists to work together to provide the necessary technology, information, and services (Gayton, 2008; MacWhinnie, 2003). Libraries have always provided study space, and are now including more group study facilities that have technology for access to both physical collection and electronic resources, as well as productivity software that allows students to work together to complete shared assignments. Besides, Lee (2005) and Townley (2001) found that the thrust of knowledge management is to create a process of valuing the organization’s intangible assets in order to best leverage knowledge internally and externally. With this regards, a growing amount of information and knowledge involves capturing an organization’s goal related knowledge as well as knowledge of it products, customers, competition, and processes, and then sharing that knowledge with the appropriate people throughout the organization. Further, knowledge management seeks to support communities of practice in creating and using knowledge. Academic libraries as constituents of the parent university should rethink and explore ways to improve their services and become learning organizations in which to discover how to capture and share tacit and explicit knowledge within the library. The changing role of academic librarians as knowledge managers emphasizes the need to constantly update or acquire new skills and knowledge to remain relevant to the today’s library environment. Academic libraries may need to restructure their functions, expand their roles and responsibilities to effectively contribute and meet the needs of a large and diverse university community (Maponya, 2004). It is important to notes that for organization such as library need to determine who knows what in an organization and how that knowledge can be created and shared. For the purpose of this research, knowledge
Knowledge Acquisition (KAc)

Acquiring knowledge is crucial to the success and development of a knowledge-based system in university library. Gorniak-Kocikowska (2001) believes that knowledge has become an instrument which everyone could and should use. Therefore, the trend of libraries seems to be an acquisition of skill related to various aspects of computer technology and almost anything possible. The reason for this is that much knowledge is stored in the individual heads and it is often lost if not captured elsewhere. The surest way to avoid collective loss of individual memory is to identify the expertise and the skills of staff and capture it. On top of that, participation of librarians are actually quite interesting in consulting their colleagues in conversion of tacit knowledge into tacit and/or explicit knowledge (Parirokh, Daneshgar, & Fattahi, 2008; Wagner, Otto, & Chung, 2002). Like many things else, it is likely to be a combination of both (tacit/explicit). Thus, libraries as trusted institutions should play an important role in this respect. Therefore, librarians need to be conversant and prepared for active participation in this area (Choy, 2007). As a result, Maija-Leena and Mirja (2005) revealed that university libraries be able to acquire only a small portion of the research literature published in the fields of their home universities. Besides, performing their traditional tasks of providing or access and instruction, libraries negotiate license agreements and form consortia for the acquisition of electronic materials. Academic staffs are the primary producers of electronic teaching materials. However, libraries have an excellent opportunity to support acquisition and access to these materials by digitalizing printed teaching materials and by taking responsibility for the copyright agreements. As experts in a variety of activities related to information and digital materials, librarians can contribute to the knowledge of lecturers. They can also track down, acquire, and introduce new electronic publications of the latest research findings including those still unknown to academic staff. Librarians should not suppose that academic staff know what librarians do, but they should make every effort to interact with them in order to build good relationships (Ducas & Michaud-Ouasty, 2003). As a result researchers, teachers and students may become more aware of librarians’ skills and abilities.

Knowledge Capture (KCa)

KM is about enhancing the use of organizational knowledge through sound practices of KM and organizational learning (B. Martin, et al., 2006; J. Martin, 2009; Mavodza, 2010). Today, library is fully capable of developing and leveraging critical knowledge to improve their performance. Zack (1999) states that library becoming so complex that knowledge is fragmented, difficult to locate and share, redundant, inconsistent or not used at all. Even knowledge and expertise that can be shared is often quickly made obsolete. According to Williams, et al., (2004) “when information and knowledge flow can be captured, organized and made accessible for reuse, there exists the potential for subsequent creation of new knowledge”. Mavodza (2010) and Daneshgar and Bosanquet (2010) states that to facilitate the capturing and transferring of both formal and informal knowledge must through knowledge networking or system. Ani, et al., (2005) found that
the use of information technology (computers, telecommunication, reprography, etc.) has a special role in the modernization of library practices. With ICT, such mechanism as electronic cataloguing, electronic online public access catalogues (OPACs), electronic acquisition and serials control, electronic circulation functions, electronic distribution of commercial publications, electronic availability of raw data, multimedia information delivery systems, digitized collections and online textbooks are all now practicable with a higher degree of user satisfaction (Ani, et al., 2005; Siddike, Munshi, & Sayeed, 2011; Tripathy, Patra, & Pani, 2007). Daneshgar and Bosanquet (2010) notes that there is a vast amount of knowledge relating to the Library’s customers. Therefore, library management is now exploring more effective methods for organizing knowledge. It is being captured to facilitate knowledge management activities such as evaluating, sharing, and storing of the customer knowledge within the ‘library’. The ‘Library’ expects that knowledge management activities will build a greater understanding of customers and their requirements. Hence, these requirements will hopefully lead to the delivery of more appropriate and timely services towards users’ satisfaction. On the other hand, the major challenge of managing knowledge is less its creation and more its capture and integration (T. H. Davenport, De Long, & Beers, 1998). However, sometimes for understanding the user needs and being able to provide adequate services or to match services with suitable philosophies and theories it is crucial for librarians and decision makers within the library to share the knowledge which was captured from the previous phase with some experts in LIS or other related disciplines (Parirokh & Fattahi, 2009). Therefore, above all knowledge has to be captured using proper documentation, through mentoring, training, surveys, etc.

**Knowledge Sharing (KSh)**

Academic libraries as constituents of the parent university should rethink and explore ways to improve their services and become learning organizations in which to discover how to capture and share tacit and explicit knowledge within the library (Maponya, 2004). The changing role of academic librarians as knowledge managers emphasizes the need to constantly update or acquire new skills and knowledge to remain relevant to the today’s library environment. Academic libraries may need to restructure their functions, expand their roles and responsibilities to effectively contribute and meet the needs of a large and diverse university community (Gurteen, 1999; Hansen, Mors, & Løvås, 2005). According to Gurteen (1999), it is also fundamental about sharing knowledge and putting that knowledge to use. Thus, to create a knowledge sharing culture it needs to encourage people to collaborate and work together more effectively, to collaborate and to share ultimately to make organizational knowledge more productive (Heiman & Nickerson, 2004).

Indeed, sharing “tacit knowledge among multiple individuals with different backgrounds, perspectives, and motivations becomes a critical step for organizational knowledge creation to take place” (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). However, it is necessary to establish what sharing knowledge really means (Riege, 2005). This implies that not all employees need to share knowledge, because it would not be re-used or applied. A study done by Wabwezi (2011) revealed that knowledge sharing does not stop at contributing to the realization of innovation but also continues after the innovation is achieved to effect its implementation or adoption.

The findings of the study also highlighted the factors that affect knowledge sharing at the university and these included organizational culture, incentives for innovation, availability of social meeting places commitment from management and sensitization. A research findings by Teh and Yong (2011) stresses that the practitioners must be aware the presence of individuals’ attitude toward knowledge sharing may not lead to intention to share knowledge. Management should create a supportive atmosphere in which knowledge can be shared via effective formal communication (e.g., office’s SharePoint portal server) and informal communication (e.g., forum and brainstorming sessions). In fact, facilitating knowledge sharing is a complicated task, as one of the major challenges concern is the willingness of organizational members to share their knowledge with other co-workers. Furthermore, it is also happen among librarians, lecturers and/or management in academic libraries. A survey results by Pengshan and Yongqin (2011) indicates that 85% of respondents reported 'Very Great' or 'Great' satisfaction. The study indicates that library is the core of Information Common
(IC), so that library can build such an environment to encourage readers or customers sharing their knowledge. In fact, library also can take advantage of the potential during the course of the knowledge sharing to fulfill their user satisfaction.

Nevertheless, there are two novel processes which have to be considered in this study. Considering the importance of Knowledge Record (KRe) and Knowledge Preserving (KP) in knowledge process, these two processes could be an important variable, which not much discussed in literature. This novel variables hope may help to predict why people choose to record and preserve knowledge in some contexts of KM practices especially at Malaysian universities library toward their users’ satisfaction.

**Knowledge Record (KRe)**

Gandhi (2004) found that numerous employees’ in organizations were asked to record their tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge (T. H. Davenport, et al., 1998; Dougherty, 1999; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995), whereby they have to write down step-by-step for everything they did. However, the main issue to be consider is that do they (i.e., individual or employee) really care to record their tacit and explicit knowledge?. Several employees were forced by organization themselves to record knowledge (Smiraglia, 2002) they had internalized as experience or memory. Knowledge of how records are used is therefore also important to be able to develop and design (Borglund, 2008; Borglund & Öberg, 2008; Yeo, 2005). As such, successful KM initiatives could help organizations to establish their internal benchmarks, identify and record best practices, and create an environment of continuous learning. KM systems implemented in libraries so far have not achieved these goals. Richardson (1995) agree that librarians need to learn from the process and avoid repeating mistakes, it is vital to record what worked, what did not work, which steps in the process were useful, and what would they do differently next time. According to Al-Hawamdeh (2002) not all types of knowledge can be recorded and codified as information. Branin (2003) agreed that librarians need to extend their expertise in creating, acquisition, dissemination selecting, organizing, record, preserving and etc. (Anjanappa, Kattimani, & Jange, 2009; Cho, et al., 2009; Delsaerdt, 2008) whereby they must willing to get outside the routines and the walls of the traditional library and work more directly with technologists, faculty, and students. Therefore, when discuses about knowledge management practice, it is clearly dealing with a set of complex issues that are interrelated and cannot be segmented (Al-Hawamdeh, 2002). A study done by Garcia (2011) revealed that the business of libraries is facilitating knowledge transfer through the effective preservation and organization of public documents and public knowledge records to ensure that it social utilization so knowledge is effectively transferred. For that, they provide monitoring, storage, retrieval, and users’ information empowerment services, and have a managerial structure, to ensure the appropriate leadership, planning, and administration of this. The important point to note by Harries (2009) is that, here (i.e. Library) dealing not just with records of actions, but also with knowledge processes and information, given meaning through content and context, and put into action working. According to author, “… If we believe that a core principle of records is that they improve accountability and good governance, then we need to consider how records management can account for, and incorporate, this social dimension and its role in the social production of knowledge. Within and between different professional communities; processes which both create and use those records”. Nevertheless, the approach for records created in the course of day-to-day business of the universities was to stored and kept in hard copies as evidence of an action, decision or process. The process of record keeping provides a framework for keeping, maintaining and providing for the disposition of records and what is contained in them. Therefore, the process intended to benefit all members of staff by facilitating continuity and evaluation of services and preserving privacy (Egwunyenga, 2009).

**Knowledge Preserving (KPr)**

It is important to state that knowledge preservation also has significant with knowledge management practice in the knowledge process. Haahr (2002) states that the preservation of knowledge, in the form of libraries allowed such communities to ‘exist’ despite the temporal separation of some of the members. To preserving the knowledge in the library (Dougherty, 1999),
there has to be a voluntary action on behalf of the individual. Anderson (1996) found that university (i.e. Academic library) could contribute to the operational of the service through purchasing and operating a portion of the hardware and software required for the service and/or via financial support towards the preservation of key material, such as certain books and journals, much like the collections now found in physical form in university libraries are built via the purchase of selected books and journals. The process of knowledge capture, sharing, record and preserving approach is technology-dominated (Hildreth & Kimble, 2002). With the increased interest in knowledge preservation that cannot be captured and recorded, a number of researchers (e.g. (Coffman, 2010; Igbeka & Ola, 2010; Tasmin & Woods, 2008) have begun to realize that library management has poses significant challenges and the existing approaches to KM are not adequate. A study done by Ismail (2006) indicates that library preservation programs take into consideration factors such as the physical environment in which information resources are housed; disaster control; pest control; handling of the resources by library staff and users; access control; conservation; reformatting; routine maintenance; library security and reader education. Librarians must preserve for posterity and therefore, good collections are:

- Attract scholars who may come to the university to teach, for sabbatical or pursue higher degrees;
- Attract requests for document supply;
- Attract gifts from scholars and book collectors because of the confidence in the Library’s preservation and access policies; and
- Make librarians proud and happy that they have discharged their duties and responsibilities well.

Nevertheless, Preservation is a professional and management responsibility. There is no access without preservation and libraries can only create and maintain bibliographic records for materials that are available. Catalogue records do not mean a thing, if libraries cannot provide the materials they describe. Nothing can be more frustrating to the researcher than to spend time at the catalogue noting call numbers but not being able to get the materials when they go looking at the stacks. They will vent their frustrations on library staff and there is nothing that library staff can do except to apologize and offer to search for the materials that they themselves fear are no longer in the library (Ismail, 2006).

Table 2 shows the Knowledge Management Process Theory introduced by Karadsheh, et al. (2009) behind the conceptual framework, which grow and/or expand in libraries to achieve KM practice. There are many knowledge processes has been introduced, however, only four core knowledge processes were selected such as Knowledge Creating (KC\text{r}), Knowledge Acquisition (KA\text{c}), knowledge Capturing (KC\text{a}) and Knowledge Sharing (KSh) has shown in one comprehensive table. Another two novel processes, which found to fulfill the gaps is Knowledge Preserving (KP\text{r}) and Knowledge Record (KR\text{e}). Therefore, KC\text{r}, KA\text{c}, KC\text{a}, KSh, KR\text{e} and KP\text{r} are becoming a main variables contributing to KM Practice against library users’ satisfaction.
Table 2. Taxonomy of KM Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KM Process</th>
<th>Description of Knowledge Process</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 2, the novel classification of KM process allows researchers to compare and better analyze the process when dealing with KM process to fulfill their user satisfaction in the library. According to Karadsheh, et al. (2009), many of the model above are broad enough to provide a complete analysis of the knowledge flow in the organization. Therefore, the proposes the novel KM process could improve the existing KM processes to provide the Knowledge Creating (KCr), Knowledge Acquisition (KAc), knowledge Capturing (KCa) and Knowledge Sharing (KSh) has illustrated in figure 4.
As shown in Figure 4, the conceptual framework was developed based on Taxonomy of KM process in Table 2, whereby Knowledge Record (KR) and Knowledge Preserving (KP) found as a novel gap in this KM practice in the library. Therefore, all six processes need to be linked with KM practice to perceive whether it has a significant impact against Library Users’ Satisfaction (LUS) in the library. Nevertheless, these processes need to be in place or cultivated strongly for the implementation of knowledge management in practices to be a success (Al-Hawamdeh, 2002).

Conclusions
This research proposes for assertion of the new KM process (i.e. Knowledge Record and Knowledge Preserving), which are applied, unfortunately they are being paid with little attention especially at Malaysian university libraries. Hence, university libraries look Knowledge Record (KR) and Knowledge Preserving (KP) as positive influences in order to provide appropriate KM practice within the library. Nevertheless, different KM researchers and practitioners use different terms, methods and views to distinguish between the types of knowledge processes into KM practice. Most these views tend to see knowledge as a dichotomy (Conklin, 1996; Hildreth & Kimble, 2002). The theoretical framework presented in this study has allowed researchers to think and contributed new factors/variables to improve the KM framework from time to time. The new factors/variables being suggested in the theoretical framework need to be tested in order to see whether they are positively related with Knowledge Management practice (KMP) at Malaysian university libraries against Library Users’ Satisfaction. In addition, the ways that knowledge management interacts with these organizational characteristics are of interest to firms and need to be explored. Knowledge management is truly an area of study of increasing interest to organizations especially in library. With this increased attention comes an opportunity for academics and researchers to participate in examining and refining new practices as they emerge. This paper offers a conceptual model that can serve as a useful context within which to frame such efforts. Hence, it is hoped that this study could be one of the significant knowledge which could contribute to a body of knowledge in recent research and enrich the literature in knowledge management.
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