

ANALYSIS OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER BLASTING FACTORS IN LIBRARY

Taufiq Kurniawan*, Andi Asari
Universitas Negeri Malang

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 16 Oct 2019

Accepted: 23 Nov 2019

Published: 20 Dec 2019

Keyword:

Knowledge Transfer,
SOP, Public Library

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify the inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer in the application of SOP in Malang City Public Library. Librarians tend to not fully understand the implementation of SOPs so that mistakes are often repeated and make operational activities ineffective. This research is a qualitative descriptive study. As important knowledge in organizations, library SOPs must be understood by all staff and librarians so that the company's operational activities run smoothly. Based on the data collection and analysis conducted, the researcher draws the conclusion that there are four factors which hinder the transfer of knowledge in the application of SOPs in libraries. The inhibiting factors are: (1) Organizational context that does not support knowledge transfer. (2) Lack of close relations between employees. (3) Lack of motivation (lack of motivation as a recipient of knowledge). (4) Lack of retention capacity (lack of use of knowledge). At this obstacle, employees and librarians still often use their old habits at work. They do not implement changes in the SOP in routine work.

The development of the business world today shows increasingly fierce competition between companies with one another so that demands management to make improvements to their competitiveness. In the context of increasing competitiveness, mastery of knowledge is an important factor for companies. A company will have good competitiveness if it has a good mastery of knowledge (Khalil, 2000 in Indriartiningtias, 2011). Some researchers have also emphasized the importance of knowledge as a company's intangible assets (Bou-Llusar & Segarra-Cipres, 2006). According to Spender (1996), intangible assets are the basis of differentiation to obtain a competitive advantage. Therefore, knowledge is one of the important strengths of driving business success (Krishnaveni & Sujatha, 2012).

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: taufiq.library@gmail.com (Taufiq Kurniawan)

Simply stated, knowledge is information that is understood through experience and judgment (Tian et al., 2009). Knowledge becomes one of the main parts in the concept of knowledge transfer or knowledge transfer which is defined as the process of transferring information, skills, and experience from sources of knowledge to recipients of knowledge (Argote & Ingram, 2000; Gouza, 2006; Yakhlef, 2007; Cumming, 2003 in Kohengkul et al., 2009). Knowledge transfer refers to the exchange of knowledge both within and between different companies (Bou-Llusar and Segarra-Cipres, 2006). Liyanage (2009) says that when an organization or employee identifies important knowledge, they can carry out a knowledge transfer process so that knowledge can benefit the organization's excellence. Knowledge transfer is at the same time a key to the learning process in organizations, namely when knowledge transferred to other parties can be used to solve problems or provide new ideas for the innovation process (Goh, 2002). However, the knowledge transfer process does not always run smoothly (Minbaeva, 2007). In fact, there are several factors that hinder the process so that it does not run as desired. The inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer are the focus of this study. Researchers want to analyze the factors that are inhibiting the knowledge transfer that occurs in a company. According to Szulanski (1996), the inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer are found in the characteristics of knowledge sources, characteristics of knowledge (messages), characteristics of organizational context, and characteristics of recipients of knowledge. This research was conducted in the Malang City public library. Based on the initial findings, there is a knowledge transfer issue related to understanding Standard Operating Procedures (hereinafter referred to as SOPs) at the staff and librarian level staff. The staff employees and librarians tend to not understand the SOPs that have been set so that in practice they often repeat mistakes. The problem of understanding the SOP has become the concern of library management because it causes the work done to be ineffective and even affects the work of staff and librarians. Based on these preliminary findings, it can be concluded that there have been inhibiting factors in knowledge transfer that resulted in incomprehension of the staff and librarians regarding the implementation of library SOPs. SOP plays a role in supporting the achievement of the mission and goals of the institution and is able to create a professional culture in the organization (Parrish, 2004). According to Carter (2001) in Parrish (2004), SOPs explain how to act, tasks to be done, or steps to be taken to get the desired results. Therefore, a good understanding of the application of SOP is important because it can explain the roles and responsibilities of each individual so that they are able to support the company in achieving its vision and mission.

Several studies related to knowledge transfer inhibitors have been conducted before. Sentani (2012) once conducted a study to identify inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer in food and beverage distributor companies. In addition, the same research was also conducted by Ningsih (2012) in one of a group of fashion companies and household basic needs in Yogyakarta. Both of these studies discuss general knowledge that occurs in a company, both tacit and explicit knowledge. Even the results of the two studies also showed that one of the factors inhibiting knowledge transfer in the object under study was the absence of SOPs or written references about existing knowledge in the company.

Whereas in this study, the focus to be investigated is precisely about explicit knowledge, namely about the SOP. The different focus of discussion is expected to provide different findings from some previous studies. The problem of knowledge transfer SOP in this study focuses on the processing and information services which are the primary activities. This research also wants to focus on the obstacles of knowledge transfer that occur from the level of leaders to their staff, considering that leaders or managers also play a role in the process of knowledge transfer about SOPs to their subordinate staff.

Based on the background above, this study aims to explain the factors that hinder knowledge transfer in the library.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Knowledge has different definitions and interpretations. Knowledge is often associated with terms such as data, information, intellectual level (intelligence), skills (experience), experience, expertise, ideas, insights, etc. which all depend on the context of the words used (Gao et al., 2008). Knowledge is defined as credible information that has potential value for an organization (Hunt, 2003). According to Davenport and Prusak (1998) in Gao et al. (2008), knowledge is a mixture of experience, values, information, and expert insights. Meanwhile, according to Bergeron (2003), knowledge is information that has been organized and summarized to improve one's understanding, understanding or awareness.

Knowledge can relate to concepts, semantic relationships, and actions or operational processes that have been proven to continue to achieve goals (Raharso, 2011). Then, Polanyi (1966) divides two types of knowledge to facilitate various definitions, namely tacit knowledge, and explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge is personal knowledge that is rooted in one's experience and insight so that it is difficult to transfer and formalize (Wong & Radcliffe, 2000). While explicit knowledge is the knowledge that is easily communicated and transferred to others. This type of knowledge can be changed in an informal and written form, such as documents, rules, and procedures such as SOPs.

Knowledge becomes one of the main parts of the concept of knowledge transfer. According to Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), knowledge will have a greater impact if the knowledge undergoes a transfer process. In general, Liyanage (2009) describes knowledge transfer as the transfer of knowledge from one place or person (source of knowledge) to another person (recipient of knowledge). Knowledge transfer is defined as the process of transferring information, skills, and experience from the source of knowledge to the recipient of knowledge (Argote & Ingram, 2000; Gouza, 2006; Yakhlef, 2007; Cumming, 2003 in Kohengkul et al., 2009). Meanwhile, according to van den Hoff and de Ridder (2004), knowledge transfer is a communication activity from one person to another about what he knows or actively consulted to gain knowledge.

The concept of knowledge transfer is often confused with the concept of knowledge sharing. Liyanage (2009) said many writers and researchers failed to provide clear definitions for both concepts. Most knowledge sharing in an organization involves the exchange of knowledge at the individual level, but the transfer of knowledge within the organization takes place at a higher level such as

groups, departments, or divisions (Argote and Ingram, 2000 in Liyanage et al., 2009). Knowledge sharing is the process of exchanging knowledge so that there is a two-way exchange of knowledge.

Whereas the process of knowledge transfer tends to be one-way from the source of knowledge to the recipient of knowledge (Liyanage, 2009). Although they have differences, the concepts between knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer have similarities. Berlo (1960) in Tjakraatmadja and Martini (2011) shows the similarity between the two concepts, which is the process of communication and knowledge transmission between communicator and communicant through communication channels (media).

Based on the statement of Berlo (1960) in Tjakraatmadja and Martini (2011), the process of knowledge transfer can be considered as a communication model that is widely known as the SMCR model (Source, Message, Channel, Recipient), or the communication component in the source, message, channel, and receiver. This is in line with the opinion of Liyanage (2009) who explains that the process of knowledge transfer is a communication activity that has two main components, namely the source or sender of knowledge and the recipient who obtains knowledge. Minbaeva (2007) also explains that some knowledge-based view studies use communication approaches in explaining the process of knowledge transfer. In his research, Minbaeva (2007) adopted a communication approach in explaining the process of knowledge transfer consisting of the sender, the message, the receiver, and the channel (organizational context). According to Liyanage (2009), the basic concept of the knowledge transfer process consists of knowledge sources, knowledge recipients, and modes (modes) in transferring knowledge. Hansen et al. (1999) argue that knowledge can be managed codified and personalized. In codification, knowledge is organized and stored in information systems. Codified knowledge transferred can be accessed and disseminated to others using networks so that the utilization of knowledge is easier to do. While personalization is the transfer of knowledge from one person to another through personal contact or direct interaction, which focuses on the occurrence of dialogue.

The success of knowledge transfer does not mean that the knowledge transferred must be received equally. Knowledge transfer does not show the full replication of knowledge from the source of knowledge to the recipient of knowledge (Krishnaveni and Sujatha, 2012). The success of knowledge transfer means that the process of knowledge transfer carried out is able to create new knowledge for the recipient of knowledge and apply that knowledge in the organization (Liyanage, 2009).

This research focuses on the concept of knowledge transfer rather than knowledge sharing. That is because the process of understanding SOP is a one-way process, namely from superiors (managers) to subordinates (staff). In addition, this research also wants to focus more on the transfer of knowledge from the source to the recipient of knowledge.

Knowledge Management (KM) refers to the process of capturing collective intelligence and expertise in organizations and using it to foster innovation through continuous organizational learning (Nonaka; Quinn et al. ; Davenport & Prusak in Shih & Chiang, 2005). Kwahk et al. (2007) defines KM as the management of various

individual and group knowledge in organizations and aims to improve organizational performance. KM includes the knowledge transfer process within the organization needed to make better decisions, act more precisely, and provide results in supporting the implementation of business strategies (Horwitch & Armacost, 2002 in Sangkala, 2007).

According to Karl Wiig in Sangkala (2007), the purpose of KM can be seen from three perspectives, namely: (1) Business perspective, which focuses on the question of why, where and for what companies must invest or utilize knowledge. This perspective is more directed towards the allocation of resources and certain leadership activities; (2) Management perspective, which identifies a number of management activities to determine, organize, direct, facilitate, and monitor knowledge related to the practices and activities needed to achieve the desired business strategies and objectives; (3) Hand-on operational perspective, which focuses on the application of expertise to channel explicit knowledge related to work and tasks in the company's operations.

In essence, KM is an integrated approach to identifying, creating, managing, sharing, and utilizing all information and knowledge possessed by the organization (Sporleder & Moss, 2002). One of the impacts of the application of KM on the internal company is the creation of a learning organization process. This was explained by Lopes et al. (2004) in Singh (2008) that KM is a process that facilitates knowledge sharing and establishes learning as a continuous process in an organization. Therefore, knowledge management and learning organizations join hands. Carneiro (2000) provides an understanding that KM is formed from various personal characteristics and personal development. The application of KM creates knowledge development in organizations that are able to shape market knowledge and competitor knowledge. Market knowledge forms innovative businesses and produces innovation while competitors' knowledge forms competitive businesses and produces competitiveness.

According to Chang and Ahn (2005), knowledge has intangible characteristics and is difficult to imitate. Therefore, the knowledge that arises in organizations can create different advantages or the company's ability to satisfy customer needs (Kaplan & Norton, 2001). According to Hansen et al. (1999), there are two strategies in conducting knowledge management, namely the codification strategy and personalization strategy. Following is an explanation of the two KM strategies according to Hansen et al. (1999): (1) Codification strategy, leads to the management of knowledge that is classified (codified) and stored in a computer database that can be accessed by anyone. This strategy requires the help of information system technology to be able to utilize knowledge; (2) Personalization strategy, is a knowledge management strategy through individuals who have expertise in that knowledge and disseminates it directly to others through interaction. The focus of this strategy is the occurrence of dialogue between individuals.

Both strategies need to be used by companies to be able to use knowledge effectively. Companies must choose one dominant strategy, then use the second strategy to support the first strategy. Hansen et al. (1999) assert that there is no absolute best strategy used by companies. Each company can use a different strategy.

Some experts express different opinions about the factors that hinder knowledge transfer because they can be influenced by many factors. Liyanage (2009) says that the obstacles or difficulties of knowledge transfer come from the source (source of knowledge) and receiver (receiver of knowledge). Inhibiting factors from the source of knowledge are identified as the match between the source with knowledge (relevance of knowledge) and the willingness (encouragement) of the source to transfer knowledge (willingness to share). While the inhibiting factors of the receiver are the absorption capacity (absorptive capacity) and the willingness to gain knowledge (willingness to acquire).

In addition, Minbaeva (2007) also discusses the obstacles in knowledge transfer. These factors include the capacity to spread the message from the source of knowledge (disseminative capacity), the characteristics of knowledge, the organizational context (the closeness between the source and the recipient of knowledge), and the absorption capacity of the recipient of knowledge (absorptive capacity). Szulanski (1996) said that the inhibiting factor in knowledge transfer is stickiness, which is interpreted as difficulty in transferring knowledge in organizations. Some researchers have previously suggested four factors that influence the difficulty of knowledge transfer, namely the characteristics of the source, the characteristics of the transfer of knowledge itself, the characteristics of the context and the characteristics of the recipient, (Szulanski, 1996). The inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer according to Szulanski (1996) have also summarized the overall inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer from several experts who have different opinions (Sentani, 2012).

In this study, the authors use inhibiting factors according to Szulanski (1996) because they are considered complete and have summarized several opinions from various experts. The inhibiting factor in the characteristics of the source has two measures namely the lack of source motivation in spreading knowledge and the ability of untrusted sources. While the barriers to the characteristics of knowledge transfer are measured by ambiguous and unproven messages. Contextual barriers are measured by organizational factors that are less supportive and the closeness of the relationship between the source and the recipient of knowledge. While barriers to recipients are measured by the capacity for absorption and storage of knowledge and lack of motivation.

According to Law No. 43 of 2007 concerning libraries, implies that the Library is an institution that manages the collection of written works, print works and / or record works in a professional manner with a standardized system to meet the educational, research, information and recreational needs of the visitors. While the Decree No. Menpan 132 of 2002 limits the documentation and information library units, namely work units that have human resources, special rooms, and collection of library materials consisting of at least 1,000 titles from various disciplines in accordance with the type of library concerned and managed according to a particular system. Thus it can be understood that a library is a work unit that occupies a special place in which there are works that are managed by applying the standard work rules. The definition of a public library according to the IFLA General Conference in 1985, a public library is a library that was established and funded by the local government, or in certain cases by the central government or an agency authorized to

act on behalf of the agency, available to the public for those who want to use it without bias or discrimination.

METHOD

This research is a descriptive study with a qualitative approach that will be carried out by processing all the information and data needed related to the problem of inhibiting the knowledge transfer factors in the application of SOP in Malang. The discussion will focus on the inhibiting factors that occur from the leadership level to the staff of the information processing and service department by using the knowledge transfer inhibiting factor according to Szulanski (1996). The data used in this study are secondary data and primary data. Secondary data were obtained from non-behavioral observations through various institutional documents such as the SOP for processing and information services and several literature studies. While the primary data is the data of interviews with the leaders and staff of the information processing and service department. The primary data includes data relating to inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer in the application of SOP, namely the characteristics of knowledge sources, characteristics of knowledge transfer, context characteristics, and characteristics of recipients of knowledge. The object of this research is the Malang City Public Library. There are two methods used for data collection in this study, namely: Observation and Interview. Data analysis was performed with an inductive approach. The steps in data analysis are as follows: Data reduction, Data presentation, Conclusion withdrawal/verification

RESULT

Characteristics of Knowledge Sources

The inhibiting factor in the source of knowledge is the lack of motivation to support the transfer of knowledge (lack of motivation). That is because the source is afraid of losing important knowledge, position (position) and excellence (superiority). Resources are also possible not to spend time and resources to support the transfer of knowledge. The second obstacle is the lack of trustworthiness of the source of knowledge in the transfer of knowledge (not perceived as reliable). The source of knowledge is considered unreliable and trustworthy so that the recipient of knowledge can reject the knowledge conveyed. That is, sources of knowledge can be assessed as those who lack the ability and adequate understanding of the application of SOPs. Several factors related to source reliability are trustworthiness, status, education, and position.

Characteristics of Knowledge Transfer

The measure of the obstacle to the characteristics of knowledge transfer is an ambiguous message. Knowledge ambiguity occurs because most of the knowledge is still in the form of tacit so that it is increasingly difficult to be accepted and understood. Ambiguous messages can also arise due to an imperfect understanding of knowledge. Causal ambiguity in this study focuses on an imperfect understanding of existing SOPs. That is, it is possible that the explanation of the SOP both explicitly and tacit (verbally) from the manager to the supervisor service point staff still makes them confused and less able to understand it. In addition, another obstacle is the unprovenness of the benefits of past knowledge (unprovenness). The knowledge that

has benefits or uses in the past is not too difficult to transfer. Therefore, data records can help in the selection of knowledge to be transferred.

Context Characteristics

Barriers to context characteristics are associated with organizational contexts that do not support the increase in knowledge transfer (barren organizational context) and the lack of communication and intimacy of relationships between members of the organization (arduous relationships). Barren organizational context is understood as an organization's efforts to support knowledge transfer. Previous research has shown that formal structures and systems, coordination and expertise, and behavior can influence the amount of effort for knowledge transfer. Barren organizational context in this study will focus on seeing whether Malang's public library facilitates the transfer of knowledge about SOPs to staff employees and librarians, such as meetings or other routines (coordination) that discuss SOP, or even provide training on SOPs. While the arduous relationship is the closeness of the relationship between the source and the recipient of knowledge. The closeness will affect knowledge transfer, especially to tacit knowledge so that it requires interaction between individuals in a greater frequency.

Characteristics of Knowledge Recipients

There are three measures in the barriers to the characteristics of knowledge recipients. First, the lack of motivation from the recipient (lack of motivation). Recipients of knowledge are reluctant and less motivated to receive knowledge from outside so that it affects passivity, pretends to accept, sabotage, or rejects directly in the implementation and use of new knowledge. The second measure is the lack of capacity (ability) of the recipient's absorption of new knowledge (lack of absorptive capacity). Recipients are considered less able to identify values and apply new knowledge. That is, the recipient of knowledge is considered difficult in understanding the SOP because of the limitations of its comprehension so that in its application it can experience problems. While the third measure is the lack of recipient capacity to routinely use new knowledge (lack of retentive capacity). This factor occurs because of the recipient's lack of ability to use new knowledge routinely and store it. This factor is also related to the memory of the recipient of knowledge. The recipients of knowledge in this study are the staff of employees and librarians of the department of information processing and general library information in Malang.

The researcher used the knowledge transfer barriers model from Szulanski (1996) in analyzing the knowledge transfer barriers regarding SOPs in library service staff. These obstacles can come from the characteristics of the source of knowledge which in this study are the leaders of the library and, the division head of the library division, the characteristics of the transferred knowledge in the form of SOPs, the characteristics of the organizational context, and the characteristics of the recipients of knowledge who are staff members of the library services. After conducting observations and interviews researchers found a picture of the inhibiting factors in the transfer of knowledge in the library institution.

Based on the results of discussions and analysis of the interview process that has been carried out, the results of the study were obtained regarding the inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer in the application of SOP in the Public Library and Regional Archives of Malang City. Based on interviews conducted, employees and

librarians do not understand SOP in the library because it is caused by several things. The main factor that causes SOP is not running optimally is because employees and librarians do not have the awareness and discipline to work in accordance with existing SOPs. They do not want to bother working and tend to use easy and practical ways without thinking about the risks that can occur. In fact, warnings that are often carried out by leaders only have a momentary impact, and then the librarian returns to the old habit of not implementing SOPs in their daily work. In addition, staff and librarians still often use their old habits at work. In their daily lives, they continue to work based on what they know and experience regardless of the applicable library SOP. So when changes and improvements to the SOP are made, librarians still often work with their old habits and do not implement library SOPs optimally.

In the organizational context, the lack of socialization and training organized by the library has an impact on less than an optimal understanding of librarians about SOPs. They become less understanding of the negative effects that can arise when working without compliance with SOPs. In addition, the lack of closeness between librarians further worsens the condition. Lack of closeness impedes communication and cooperation between staff. In fact, the maximum application of SOP requires smooth communication between the staff so that the library operational process can run well. Therefore, it takes several steps that can be considered for the Public Library and Archives of Malang City in solving this problem. The first step is to conduct socialization and training on library SOPs as a communication medium in providing an understanding of SOPs. Through socialization and training, it is hoped that library division heads will be more aware of library SOPs and the negative impacts that will occur if they work without complying with SOPs. In addition, the library has not carried out maximum socialization and training for this latest SOP, so this step is needed by the Public Library and Regional Archives of Malang. The training method is one of the best communication media used in knowledge transfer because there is face-to-face interaction with the interlocutor, fast feedback, and able to accommodate even difficult knowledge transfers. In addition, the library also needs to hold a meeting for staff and librarians, so that intimacy is more maintained so that communication between employees in running the SOP can run smoothly. In creating intimacy also requires the role of leaders to always open themselves and invite staff and librarians to get used to communicating smoothly between them. The role of leadership is expected to create a family atmosphere in the library so that communication between staff and librarians is smooth and the implementation of SOPs in the Public Library and Regional Archives of Malang City can run well in line with expectations.

DISCUSSION

The leadership is also expected to be able to provide supervision and be firm in giving sanctions or penalties to any staff and librarians who do not carry out library SOPs at work. This can have a deterrent effect on those who work without SOPs. In addition to the deterrent effect, staff employees and librarians also need to be motivated to run library SOP optimally. The Public Library and Archives of the City of Malang can take a policy by including disciplinary steps to implement library

SOPs in providing existing incentives. That is, one job evaluation in providing incentives for staff employees and librarians is to be able to run library SOPs to the fullest. Measures of discipline implementing SOPs can be included in performance bonuses because so far bonuses are only based on targets made by each individual without performance appraisals based on SOPs.

Library management policy to include SOP discipline in work assessment, it can motivate employees and librarians to work in accordance with SOPs because bonuses received by each individual will be greater if library SOPs are applied to the maximum. The Public Library and Archives of Malang City also need to apply good knowledge management. That is, library SOP as an important knowledge in the organization that needs to be mastered by each staff employee and librarian, needs to be managed optimally. The maximum application of knowledge management can create learning organizations on an ongoing basis and aims to improve the performance and implementation of business strategies.

SOP as explicit knowledge explains how to act, the tasks that must be done, or the steps that must be taken to get the desired results. Therefore, the application of maximum knowledge management by libraries will create learning in organizations about how to act, tasks that must be carried out, or steps that must be taken to get the desired results, namely the vision and mission of the Public Library and Archives of the City of Malang. The existence of a learning organization process in a library SOP on an ongoing basis will make employees and librarians able to master the SOP well so that it will improve performance. While the codification strategy with the help of information systems to manage SOPs has not been carried out. So it is better if the Public Library and Archives of Malang City implement maximum knowledge management with the help of a computer database to manage library SOPs. Staff and librarians will be able to access library SOPs more easily when they face operational obstacles.

CONCLUSION

This research is motivated by less than one optimal understanding of staff employees and librarians towards library SOPs. This is indicated by the repetition of errors that often occur in the application of library SOPs so as to make operational activities ineffective. Therefore, this study aims to identify the inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer in the application of SOP in the Public Library and Regional Archives of Malang City. use inhibiting factors of knowledge transfer according to Szulanski, which consists of characteristics of the source of knowledge, characteristics of knowledge (messages), characteristics of the organizational context, and characteristics of recipients of knowledge.

As important knowledge in organizations, library SOPs must be understood by all staff and librarians so that the company's operational activities run smoothly. Based on the data collection and analysis carried out in the previous section, the researcher draws the conclusion that there are four factors which hinder the transfer of knowledge in the application of SOPs in libraries. The inhibiting factors are: (1) Organizational context that does not support knowledge transfer. In this obstacle the library is not optimal in conducting socialization and training of SOPs because the socialization and training of SOP specifically for all employees are only held once so

that employees and librarians do not fully understand SOPs; (2) Lack of close relations between employees. Lack of closeness between employees causes less intermittent communication and cooperation so that the impact on SOP implementation is less than the maximum; (3) Lack of motivation (lack of motivation as a recipient of knowledge). Employees and librarians lack awareness and discipline in implementing SOPs. They don't want to bother working and tend to use easy and practical ways without thinking about the risks that can occur if you don't run an SOP; (4) Lack of retention capacity (lack of use of knowledge). At this obstacle, employees and librarians still often use their old habits at work. They cannot implement changes in SOPs that exist in their daily work.

The following are some suggestions that researchers can propose for libraries in overcoming the problem of transfer of knowledge about SOPs: (1) Organizing socialization and training on SOPs; (2) Organizing gathering activities for employees so that intimacy is more maintained so that communication between employees in carrying out SOPs can run smoothly; (3) The leadership must provide supervision and be firm in giving sanctions or penalties to every employee and librarian who does not implement SOPs at work; (4) There is a management policy to include discipline measures in implementing SOPs in evaluating individual performance to award performance appraisal bonuses.

REFERENCE

- Bergeron, B. (2003). *Essential of Knowledge Managemet*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bou-Llusar, J. C. & Segarra-Ciprés, M. (2006). Strategic Knowledge Transfer And Its Implications For Competitive Advantage: An Integrative Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 10: pg. 100-112.
- Carneiro, A. (2000). How Does Knowledge Management Influence Innovation And Competitiveness. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 4: pg. 87-98.
- Chang, S-G. & Ahn, J-H. (2005). Product And Process Knowledge In The Performance-Oriented Knowledge Management Approach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 9: pg. 114-132.
- Collis, D.J., & Montgomery, C.A. (2005). *Corporate Strategy: A Resource-Based Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cooper, R. D. & Schindler, S.P. (2011). *Business Research Methods*. New York:Mc Graw-Hill.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2009). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Gao, F., Li, M., & Clarke, S. (2008). Knowledge, management, and knowledge management in business operations. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 12: pg. 3-17.
- Goh, S. C. (2002). Managing Effective Knowledge Transfer: An Integrative Framework And Some Practice Implications. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 6: pg. 23-30.

- Grant, R.M. (1996). Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 17: pg. 109-122.
- Hansen M., Nohria N., & Tierney, T. (1999). What's Your Strategy for Managing Knowledge? *Harvard Business Review*. March-April, pg. 1-10.
- Hunt, D. P. (2003). The Concept Of Knowledge And How To Measure It. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. Vol. 4: pg. 100-113.
- Indriartiningtias, R. (2011). Validasi Model Transfer Pengetahuan Dari Perguruan Tinggi Ke Industri Kecil. *Jurnal Teknik Industri*. Vol. 12: pg. 118-125.
- Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P. (2001). *The Strategy-Focused Organization*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press
- Kohengkul, S., Wongwanich, S., & Wiratchai, N. (2009). Influences Of Strategies, Knowledge Sharing And Knowledge Transfer On The Success Of University-School Collaboration In Research And Development. *Research in Higher Education Journal*. Vol. 5: pg. 1-15.
- Krishnaveni, R. & Sujatha, R. (2012). Communities of Practice: An Influencing Factor for Effective Knowledge Transfer in Organizations. *IUP Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 10: pg. 26-40.
- Kwahk, K.Y., Kim, H.W., & Chan, H.C. (2007). A Knowledge Integration Approach for Organizational Decision Support. *Journal of Database Management*. Vol. 18: pg. 41-61.
- Liyanage, C., Elhag, T., Ballal, T., & Li, Q. (2009). Knowledge Communication And Translation-A Knowledge Transfer Model. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 13: pg. 118-131.
- Minbaeva, D. B. (2007). Knowledge Transfer in Multinational Corporations. *Management International Review*. Vol. 47: pg. 567-593.
- Murray, S.R. & Peyrefitte, J. (2007). Knowledge Type and Communication Media Choice in the Knowledge Transfer Process. *Journal of Managerial Issues*. Vol. 19: pg. 111-133.
- Ningsih, W. L. (2012). *Transfer Pengetahuan Pada Toko Peni Grup di Yogyakarta*. Yogyakarta: Magister Manajemen Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create The Dynamics of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Parrish, M.E. (2004). *Methodology For Establishing Standard Operating Procedures For Central Yavapai Fire District*. Arizona: National Fire Academy.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The Tacit Dmension*. New York: Anchor Day.
- Raharso, S. (2011). Mengelola Pekerja Pengetahuan. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*. Vol. 7: hal. 34-44.
- Sangkala. (2007). *Knowledge Management: Suatu Pengantar Memahami Bagaimana Organisasi Mengelola Pengetahuan Sehingga Menjadi Organisasi Yang Unggul*. Jakarta: PT Rajawali Press.
- Sentani, R. A. S. (2012). *Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Menghambat Transfer Pengetahuan Pada PT Jogja Kulina Utama*. Yogyakarta: Magister Manajemen Universitas Gadjah Mada.

- Shih, H.A., & Chiang, Y.H. (2005). Strategy Alignment Between HRM, KM, and Corporate Development. *International Journal of Manpower*. Vol. 26: pg. 582-603.
- Singh, S.K. (2008). Role Of Leadership In Knowledge Management: A Study. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 12: pg. 3-15.
- Sponder, J.C. (1996). Making Knowledge The Basis Of A Dynamic Theory Of The Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 17: pg. 45-62.
- Sporleder, T.L. & Moss, L.E. (2002). Knowledge Management in the Global Food System: Network Embeddedness and Social Capital. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics Association*. Vol: 84: pg. 1345-1352.
- Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring Internal Stickiness: Impediments to the Transfer of Best Practice within the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 17: pg. 27-43.
- Teece, D., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management . *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 18: pg. 509-533.
- Tian, J., Nakamori, Y., & Wierzbicki, A. P. (2009). Knowledge Management And Knowledge Creation In Academia: A Study Based On Surveys In A Japanese Research University. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 13: pg. 76-92.
- Tjakraatmadja, H.J., & Martini, L. (2011). Knowledge Sharing in Academic Institution: Relationship between Knowledge Sharing, Channel Richness, and Absorptive Capacity. *The 2nd International Research Symposium in Service Management Yogyakarta*. 26 – 30 July 2011.
- Van den Hooff, B. & de Ridder, J.A. (2004). Knowledge Sharing In Context – The Influence Of Organisational Commitment, Communication Climate And CMC Use On Knowledge Sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 8: pg. 117-30.
- Wong, W.L.P. & Radcliffe, D.F. (2000). The Tacit Nature Of Design Knowledge. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*. Vol. 12: pg. 493-512.
- http://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/index.php?mod=penelitian_detail&sub=Penelitian_Detail&act=view&typ=html&buku_id=59096
- http://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/index.php?mod=penelitian_detail&sub=Penelitian_Detail&act=view&typ=html&buku_id=56689&obyek_id=4