



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA  
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA  
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

**EVALUATION OF THE INNOPAC LIBRARY SYSTEM IN SELECTED  
CONSORTIA AND LIBRARIES IN THE SOUTHERN AFRICAN REGION:  
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE LESOTHO LIBRARY CONSORTIUM**

**By  
NTHABISENG TAOLE**

**submitted in accordance with the requirements  
for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**in the subject**

**INFORMATION SCIENCE**

**at the**

**UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA**

**PROMOTER: PROF. ARCHIE DICK**

**August 2008**



## DECLARATION

Student Number: 24495787

I declare that

**EVALUATION OF THE INNOPAC LIBRARY SYSTEM IN SELECTED CONSORTIA AND LIBRARIES IN THE SOUTHERN AFRICAN REGION: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE LESOTHO LIBRARY CONSORTIUM** is my own work and that all the sources used and quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

-----  
Ms Nthabiseng Taole

-----  
Date

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to the following people, who have contributed towards the completion of my study:

- Special thanks go to Prof. A.L. Dick, my promoter, for his guidance, support and encouragement throughout my studies. His sharp eye for details shaped this study to the very end. I thank him for teaching me patience and perseverance, which I needed most, especially during the data collection phase of the study. His belief in my abilities to carry out this study gave me extra strength.
- My appreciation goes to the library management, system managers and library personnel of the following institutions: Central University of Technology, University of Limpopo (Medunsa Campus), Tshwane University of Technology, University of the Free State, University of South Africa, University of the Witwatersrand and Vaal University of Technology. I also wish to thank system managers of Botswana College of Agriculture, National University of Science and Technology (Zimbabwe) and University of Namibia libraries.
- My deepest gratitude goes to Mrs. Lettie Erasmus, whom I had to visit many times throughout the period of my study. Her insight into consortia and library systems matters assisted me in various ways.
- I must acknowledge the invaluable input of Mr. Philip Clarke, the Project Manager of South Eastern Academic Libraries System.
- I owe special thanks to library heads of the Lesotho Library Consortium for sharing with me ideas and inspirations about the common library system for LELICO



- Many thanks go to Mrs. Marilyn Farquharson for her professional proofreading services and Mrs. ‘Mampaila Lebotsa for editing part of my study.
- I would like to express my deep gratitude to my Mum, friends and family, especially my daughter Mpho whose “Mummy knows it all” belief was constantly challenged when she saw many corrected scripts of my study.
- I thank Drs Mike van der Linde and Andriette Bekker of the Department of Statistics, University of Pretoria for their guidance during data analysis.
- I want to thank the National University of Lesotho, and in particular the staff of the Thomas Mofolo Library with whom I spent most of my working life. Their support and encouragement is highly appreciated.
- My deep gratitude goes to the Canon Collins Trust, which provided all financial assistance for this study.
- Above all, I thank my Heavenly Father for giving me strength and courage to undertake this study. I know that I was divinely guided to all the events, circumstances and the people who contributed to the completion of this study. All Blessing, Honour, Glory and Power Be Unto Him!

... Nthabiseng

## **ABSTRACT**

### **ABSTRACT**

Resource sharing is considered to be one of the most important pillars of library service, because no single library can meet all the needs of its users. Libraries have always cooperated to meet the increasing demands of users by sharing their resources. In the past few decades, the need to establish library consortia emerged more strongly as libraries began to take advantage of technology to improve access to information and service delivery.

There has been a notable increase in the formation of library consortia on the African continent. South Africa has taken the lead both in the amount of established consortia and the number of member libraries within them. This development accompanied the implementation of common library systems in consortia, where a single system is adopted by all member libraries. In the Southern African region, the library system called INNOPAC/Millennium Pac has already been adopted by consortia and libraries in Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. The recently-established Lesotho Library Consortium (LELICO) also recognized the need for a comprehensive investigation to identify a common system that will effectively meet the needs of its member libraries.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the successes and limitations of the INNOPAC library system operating in consortia and libraries in the Southern African region, in order to assess its suitability for LELICO. The study focused on two South African consortia (The Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium – GAELIC, and The Free State Library and Information Consortium - FRELICO), two university libraries (Namibia and Zimbabwe) and one agricultural college library (Botswana) in the Southern African region that use the system. A special emphasis was the criteria of assessment that would apply to a small, multi-type

consortium in a developing country like Lesotho. Data was collected through a literature search, questionnaires, interviews, site visits, and analysis of policy and institutional documents. The target groups of the study were the library managers, system managers, and library professionals of selected GAELIC and FRELICO libraries, and the system managers of the three selected libraries in the region.

The study found that the INNOPAC library system is performing satisfactorily in the chosen consortia and libraries, and that it has a positive impact on them. It performed to a high standard in all the key areas, and this may be attributed to keeping abreast of the latest developments in the library world, and offering a range of services that meet the needs of libraries. The study found further that the INNOPAC library system contributed towards increased productivity, improved customer services, and better decision making in the two consortia. However, direct access to members' holdings was restricted by a decentralized server model adopted by these consortia.

This and other lessons shaped a proposal for the implementation and management of the INNOPAC library system in LELICO. A proposed model recommends a central server as a more cost-effective management solution. The model also explains the mode of operation by member libraries and the coordinated structures that would implement and manage the INNOPAC library system, adapted to the specific requirements of a small, multi-type consortium in a developing country like Lesotho. Given its successful performance in consortia and libraries across Southern African countries, the study recommends further research into the advantages and challenges of INNOPAC for wider regional library cooperation.



**KEYWORDS:**

Information and communication technologies

Information management

Information retrieval systems

Library consortia

Library co-operation

Library systems

Library system evaluation

Resource sharing

INNOPAC

Lesotho Library Consortium

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xvii

### CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	8
1.3 Methodology.....	10
1.4 Significance of the study.....	13
1.5 Limitations.....	14
1.6 Definitions of terms.....	14
1.7 Chapter outline.....	16
1.8 Conclusion.....	18

### CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.....	19
2.2 Motivation for library co-operation.....	20
2.3 Library co-operation in developed countries.....	21
2.4 Library co-operation in developing countries.....	24
2.4.1 Co-operation in Latin America and the Caribbean.....	24
2.4.2 Co-operation in Asia.....	25
2.4.3 Co-operation in Africa.....	27
2.4.3.1 Library consortia in South Africa.....	30
2.4.3.1.1 Cape Library Consortium.....	31
2.4.3.1.2 Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium.....	33



2.4.3.1.3	Free State Library Consortium.....	37
2.4.3.1.4	Eastern Seaboard Association of Libraries.....	38
2.4.3.1.5	South Eastern Academic Library System.....	39
2.4.3.2	Lesotho Library Consortium.....	41
2.5	Success factors in the management of a library consortium.....	43
2.5.1	Governance.....	43
2.5.2	Technological infrastructure.....	44
2.5.3	Common purpose.....	45
2.5.4	Funding.....	45
2.6	Limitations and challenges facing library consortia.....	46
2.7	Systems in libraries.....	48
2.7.1	Library systems in consortia.....	49
2.7.2	INNOPAC library system.....	51
2.7.4	INNOPAC library system in GAELIC and FRELICO.....	53
2.7.4	INNOPAC in some Southern African countries.....	55
2.8	Evaluation of library systems.....	57
2.8.1	Importance of evaluation in library systems.....	58
2.8.2	Evaluative studies of the INNOPAC library system.....	59
2.8.2.1	Functional performance of automated systems: a comparative study of HORIZON, INNOPAC and VTLS.....	59
2.8.2.2	A library's integrated online library system: an assessment and hardware implementation.....	61
2.8.2.3	A survey of GAELIC members on Innovative Interface Inc. as a company and INNOPAC as a library system.....	62
2.8.2.4	GAELIC institutional member survey.....	66
2.9	Conclusion.....	67

### **CHAPTER THREE – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

3.1	Introduction.....	70
3.2	General perspective.....	70
3.3	Research design.....	72



3.4	Target Groups.....	73
3.4.1	Library staff of GAELIC and FRELICO.....	74
3.4.2	System librarians of five GAELIC libraries, two FRELICO libraries and three libraries in the Southern African region.....	74
3.4.3	Library management of GAELIC and FRELICO.....	75
3.4.4	SEALS system manager.....	76
3.4.5	LELICO library heads.....	76
3.5	Sampling techniques.....	76
3.5.1	GAELIC.....	76
3.5.2	FRELICO.....	77
3.5.3	LELICO.....	77
3.5.4	Other Southern African libraries.....	78
3.6	Data collection methods.....	78
3.6.1	Questionnaires.....	79
3.6.2	Interviews.....	81
3.6.3	Observation.....	83
3.6.4	Document analysis.....	85
3.7	Issues relating to data quality.....	87
3.7.1	Reliability.....	87
3.7.2	Validity.....	88
3.8	Data analysis and interpretation.....	89
3.8.1	Analysis of quantitative data.....	89
3.8.2	Analysis of qualitative data.....	90
3.9	Conclusion.....	91

## **CHAPTER FOUR – DATA ANALYSIS**

4.1	Introduction.....	92
4.1.1	Questionnaire response rate.....	92
4.1.2	Interviews.....	96
4.1.3	Challenges encountered.....	98
4.1.4	Categories of analysis.....	98

4.1.5	Pre-testing of data collection instruments.....	99
4.2	INNOPAC library system’s performance.....	100
4.2.1	Introduction.....	100
4.2.2	Performance of the INNOPAC library system.....	102
4.2.2.1	Functionality.....	104
4.2.2.2	Usability.....	105
4.2.2.3	Support and training.....	106
4.2.2.4	System management.....	107
4.2.2.5	Vendor.....	107
4.2.3	Membership and value of support groups.....	108
4.2.3.1	Membership of Innovative listserv, Innovative User Groups and GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup.....	108
4.2.3.2	Value of Innovative listserv, Innovative User Groups and GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup.....	109
4.2.4	Problems encountered with the system.....	110
4.3	Performance of the INNOPAC library system in three selected libraries in other Southern African countries.....	111
4.3.1	Introduction.....	111
4.3.2	Performance of the system in BCA, NUST and UNAM libraries	
4.3.2.1	Library modules.....	111
4.3.2.2	Functionality.....	112
4.3.2.3	Usability.....	112
4.3.2.4	Support and training.....	113
4.3.2.5	Vendor.....	114
4.3.2.6	Membership and value of Innovative lists and user groups.....	114
4.4	Impact of the INNOPAC library system on libraries.....	115
4.4.1	Introduction.....	115
4.4.2	Impact of the INNOPAC library system on selected GAELIC and FRELICO libraries.....	116
4.4.3	Benefits derived from using the INNOPAC library system.....	117
4.5	Cost-benefit analysis of the INNOPAC library system.....	118

4.5.1	Costs incurred by libraries using the INNOPAC library system.....	118
4.5.2	Analysis of costs against benefits .....	118
4.6	Benefits of consortium membership.....	119
4.6.1	Motivation for joining consortia.....	119
4.6.2	Benefits derived from consortium membership.....	120
4.6.3	Factors leading to successful management of a library consortium.....	120
4.7	Centralised and decentralised server models.....	121
4.8	Analysis on LELICO.....	123
4.8.1	Automation status of LELICO members.....	123
4.8.2	Benefits derived from LELICO membership.....	125
4.8.2.1	Derived benefits.....	125
4.8.2.2	Expected benefits.....	126
4.8.2.3	Proposal of activities.....	126
4.8.3	Requirements of LELICO common library system.....	127
4.8.3.1	Modules required.....	127
4.8.3.2	System properties.....	128
4.8.3.2.1	Functionality.....	128
4.8.3.2.2	Usability.....	128
4.8.3.2.3	Support and training.....	129
4.8.3.2.4	Vendor.....	130
4.8.4	Funding for LELICO members.....	131
4.9	Conclusion.....	132

## **CHAPTER FIVE - INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

5.1	Introduction.....	134
5.2	The INNOPAC library system performance in GAELIC, FRELICO and three institutions in other Southern African countries.....	133
5.2.1	Performance of the system in GAELIC and FRELICO.....	133
5.2.2	Performance of the system in three institutions in other Southern African countries.....	136
5.2.3	Impact of the INNOPAC library System.....	137



5.2.4	Cost-benefit Analysis of the INNOPAC library system.....	138
5.3	Benefits of consortium membership.....	140
5.4	Experiences on central and decentralised system server models.....	143
5.5	LELICO automation status and its system requirements.....	145
5.5.1	Proposal of activities for LELICO.....	146
5.5.2	System requirements for LELICO common library system.....	149
5.5.3	Cost implications for implementing the system.....	151
5.6	Conclusions.....	152

## **CHAPTER SIX – IMPLEMENTING LELICO COMMON LIBRARY SYSTEM**

6.1	Introduction.....	155
6.2	Lessons learned from the Southern African region.....	156
6.3	A proposal for implementing the LELICO common library system.....	160
6.3.1	Preamble.....	160
6.3.2	System server model.....	161
6.4	Functions and features of the system.....	162
6.5	System management structure.....	166
6.5.1	The INNOPAC Steering Committee.....	168
6.6	Mode of operation.....	170
6.7	Adapting the INNOPAC library system to the specific requirements of a small consortium in a developing country.....	172
6.8	An INNOPAC-based ‘virtual consortium’ for the Southern African region.....	173
6.9	Conclusion.....	175

## **CHAPTER SEVEN – CONCLUSION**

7.1	Introduction.....	177
7.2	Findings.....	178
7.3	Recommendations.....	192
7.4	Suggestions for future research.....	195
7.5	Conclusion.....	198



**REFERENCES**..... 200

**APPENDICES**

Appendix 1 Letter of introduction..... 216  
Appendix 2 Questionnaire for library management..... 217  
Appendix 3 Questionnaire for library professionals..... 221  
Appendix 4 Questionnaire for system management..... 225  
Appendix 5 Questionnaire for system managers – other Southern African libraries. 231  
Appendix 6 Questionnaire for LELICO library heads..... 237  
Appendix 7 Observation Guide..... 242  
Appendix 8 Interview Schedule - System managers..... 243  
Appendix 9 Interview Schedule – SEALS Project Manager ..... 246

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	GAELIC institutions after merging.....	34
Table 2	FRELICO institutions after merging.....	37
Table 3	ESAL institutions after merging.....	39
Table 4	SEALS institutions after merging.....	40
Table 5	Findings of the Nevada study on the INNOPAC library system.....	62
Table 6	Questionnaires received per institution.....	92
Table 7	Institutions where interviews were conducted.....	96
Table 8	Modules used per institutional library.....	101
Table 9	Library professionals rating of modules.....	103
Table 10	System managers rating of modules.....	104
Table 11	Functionality.....	105
Table 12	Usability.....	106
Table 13	Support and training.....	106
Table 14	System management.....	107
Table 15	Vendor.....	108
Table 16	Membership of Innovative listserv, User Groups and GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup.....	109
Table 17	Value of Innovative listserve, User Groups and GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup.....	109
Table 18	Problems encountered with the system.....	110
Table 19	Performance of modules in BCA, NUST and UNAM libraries.....	112
Table 20	Performance on system functionality.....	112
Table 21	Performance on system usability.....	113

Table 22	Performance on support and training.....	113
Table 23	Permanence on system vendor.....	114
Table 24	Previous library systems used by selected GAELIC and FRELICO members.....	115
Table 25	Reasons for changing to the INNOPAC library system.....	116
Table 26	Impact of the INNOPAC library system on selected GAELIC and FRELICO members.....	116
Table 27	Benefits derived from using the INNOPAC library system.....	117
Table 28	Nature of costs incurred and costs in SA rands.....	118
Table 29	Motivation for joining a consortium.....	119
Table 30	Benefits derived from consortium membership.....	120
Table 31	Important factors for consortium management.....	121
Table 32	Advantage and disadvantages of central and decentralised server models.....	122
Table 33	Automation status of LELICO libraries.....	123
Table 34	Problems encountered with current systems in LELICO libraries .....	124
Table 35	Proposal of activities for LELICO .....	126
Table 36	Importance of functionality elements for LELICO common library system.....	128
Table 37	Importance of usability elements for LELICO common library system	129
Table 38	Importance of support and training elements for LELICO common library system .....	129
Table 39	Importance of vendor elements for LELICO common library system..	130





Table 40 Budget status among LELICO member libraries..... 132

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1 LELICO library system..... 164

Figure 2 The proposed LELICO network..... 165

Figure 3 Modified management structure..... 169

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AACR2	–	Anglo-American Cataloguing Code, Second Edition
ABINA	–	Asociacion de Estados Iberoamericanos para el Desarrollo de las Bibliotecas Nacionales de Iberoamerica
ACURL	–	Association of Caribbean University Research and Institutional Libraries
ALA	–	American Library Association
AR	–	Agricultural Research
ARL	–	Association of Research Libraries
BCA	–	Botswana College of Agriculture
CALICO	–	Cape Library Consortium
CALIS	–	China Academic Library and Information System
CD-ROM	–	Compact disc read-only memory
CERNET	–	China Education and Research Network
ChinaGBN	–	China Golden Bridge Network
ChinaNet	–	China Network
CLSI	–	CL System Inc.
CSTNet	–	China Science and Technology Network
CUP	–	Committee of University Principals
CURL	–	Consortium of University Research Libraries
CUT	–	Central University of Technology
DANIDA	–	Danish International Development Assistance

DDC	–	Dewey Decimal Classification
DELNET	–	Delhi Library Network
ELP	–	Electronic Library Project
ESAL	–	Eastern Seaboard Association of Libraries
ERM	–	Electronic Resource Management
FOTIM	–	Foundation of Tertiary Education Institutions in the Northern Metropolis
FRELICO	–	Free State Library and Information Consortium
GAELIC	–	Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium
GISW	–	GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup
Gcats	–	GAELIC Cataloguing and Technical Services Workgroup
ICOLC	–	International Coalition of Library Consortia
ICTs	–	Information Communication Technologies
IDM	–	Institute of Development Management
III	–	Innovative Interfaces Inc.
INDEST	–	Indian National Digital Library in Science and Technology
IT	–	Information Technology
ITS	–	Integrated Tertiary Software
IUG	–	Innovative User Group
IUG: SA	–	Innovative User Group: Southern Africa
IULC	–	Inter-University Library Committee
JANET	–	Joint Academic Network
LAC	–	Lesotho Agricultural College

LAN	–	Local Area Network
LARRP	–	Latin Americanist Research Resources Project
LCE	–	Lesotho College of Education
LELICO	–	Lesotho Library Consortium
LHDA	–	Lesotho Highlands Development Authority
LIPAM	–	Lesotho Institute of Public Administration and Management
LNLS	–	Lesotho National Library Service
LP	–	Lerotholi Polytechnic
LPPA	–	Lesotho Planned Parenthood Association
MARC	–	Machine-readable Cataloguing
MEDUNSA	–	Medical University of Southern Africa
NASTLIC	–	National Scientific and Technology Library and Information Centre
NUL	–	National University of Lesotho
OCLC	–	Online Computer Library Center
OPAC	–	Online Public Access Catalogue
OSISA	–	Open Society for Southern Africa
NUST	–	National University of Science and Technology
PJ	–	Palace of Justice
PL	–	Parliament of Lesotho
PU for CHE	–	Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education
RAU	–	Rand Afrikaans University
SABINET	–	South African Bibliographic and Information Network
SADC	–	Southern African Development Community

SAIS	–	Southern African Interlending Scheme
SAMARC	–	South African Machine Readable Catalogue
SCONUL	–	Standing Conference of National and National and University Libraries
SDC	–	System Development Corporation
SEALS	–	South Eastern Academic Libraries System
SMTP	–	Simple Mail Transfer Protocol
SPSS	–	Statistical Package for Social Scientists
TCP/IP	–	Transfer Control Protocol/Internet Protocol
TUT	–	Tshwane University of Technology
UCEW	–	University College of Education at Winneba
UDS	–	University for Development Studies
UFS	–	University of the Free State
UNAM	–	University of Namibia
UNIN	–	University of the North
UNISA	–	University of South Africa
U.K.	–	United Kingdom
UP	–	University of Pretoria
USA	–	United States of America
USMARC	–	United States Machine-readable cataloguing
UST	–	University of Science and Technology
WAM	–	Web Access Management
WAN	–	Wide Area Network

- WCLC – Western Cape Library Cooperation
- WCTIT – Western Cape Tertiary Institutions Trust
- ZULC – Zimbabwe Universities Library Consortium