

REFERENCES:

ACKERMAN, D. 2007. Interview, Central University of Technology: Bloemfontein. (14 June 2007)

ADAMS, G. and Schvaneveldt, J. 1985. *Understanding research methods*. New York: Longman

ADAMS, R. 1986. *Information technology: a future for academic libraries*. London: Croom Helm.

ADEOGUN, M.O. 2004. *Managing resource sharing in selected Seventh-day Adventist tertiary institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa: problems and prospects*, (Unpublished thesis), Pretoria: University of South Africa.

ALEMNA, A.A. 1998. An overview of library management practices in West Africa, *Library Management*, 19(1), pp 9-11.

ALEMNA, A.A. and ANTWI, I.K. 2002. A review of consortia building among university libraries in Africa. *Library Management*, 23(4/5), pp 234-238.

ALLEN, B.M. and HIRSHON, A. 1998. Hanging together to avoid hanging separately: opportunities for academic libraries and consortia, *Information Technology and Libraries*, 17(1), pp 36-44.

BADWEN, D. 1990. *User-oriented evaluation of information systems and services*. Aldershot: Bower.

BAILEY, K. 1978. 2nd ed. *Methods of social research*, London: Free Press.

BAK, N. 2004. *Completing your thesis: a practical guide*. Pretoria: Van Schaik

BAKER, K. 2003. Bridging the digital divide: working toward equity of access through document supply services in South Africa. (Online), Available:

http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00006473/01/Baker_K_-_Bridging_the_Digital_Divide.pdf

[Accessed: 18 April 2008]

BAKER, S.L. and LANCASTER, F.W. 1991. *The measurement and evaluation of library services*. 2nd ed. Arlington: Information Resources.

BALLARD, T. 1995. *INNOPAC: a reference guide to the system*. Medford: Information Today.

BENNETT, J. 2003. *Evaluation methods in research*. London: Continuum

BESEMER, S.P. 1987. Criteria for the evaluation of library network. *Resource Sharing and Information Networks*, 14(1), pp 17-38.

BERRY, J. 1994. Will success spoil Innovative Interfaces? *Library Journal*, 119(15), pp 44-46.

BLEY, R. 2000. NESLI: a successful national consortium, *Library Consortium Management*, 2(1), pp 18-28.

BOISSE, J.A. 1995. Library cooperation: a remedy but not a panacea, *IFLA Journal* 21(1), pp 89-93.

BOOTH, A. 1988. *Qualitative evaluation of information technology in communication systems*, London: Taylor Graham

BOSS, R.W. 1998. Information Technology Plan for a Consortium. *Library Technology Reports*, 34(1), pp 69-92.

BOSTICK, S.L. 2001. The history and development of academic library consortia in the United States: an overview. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 27(1), pp 128-130.

BRYMAN, A. 2001. *Social research methods*. Oxford: University Press

BUSHA, C.H. and HARTER, S.P. 1980. *Research methods in librarianship*, New York: Academic Press

BUTCHER, N. 2000. *Information and communication technologies in South African higher education*. [online]. Available:
<http://www.saide.org.za/nadeosa/conference2000/butcher.htm> Accessed: [10/07/2003].

CAMPBELL, G.I. 1879. Grouping of places for library purposes, *Library Journal*, 4, pp 409-410.

CHAUDHRY, A.S. and ASHOOR, S. 1998. Functional performance of automated systems: a comparative study of HORIZON, INNOPAC and VTLS, *Program*, 34(4), pp 391-402.

CHISENGA, J. 1995. Thomas Mofolo Library Information System: Global Design Report, Roma: National University of Lesotho (Unpublished).

CLARKE, A. and DAWSON, R. 1999. *Evaluation research: an introduction to principles, methods and practice*, London: Sage.

COLLINS, K.J. et al 2000. *Research in the social sciences*, Pretoria: University of South Africa

Computers in Libraries International 93: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Computers in Libraries International Conference held in London in February 1993, London: Meckler

Computers in South African libraries. 1988. Proceedings of the Symposium on Computerisation in South African Libraries held at the South African Library Cape Town on 18 –20 November 1987, Cape Town: South African Library

CORNISH, A. 2001. The consortial experience with library systems: a report of the LITA library consortia and Automated Systems Interest Group Meeting. American Library Association Annual Conference, San Francisco, June 2001, *Technical Services Quarterly*, 19(3), pp 61-65.

DARCH, C. and UNDERWOOD, P.G. 1999. Dirt road or yellow brick superhighway? Information and communication technology in academic libraries of South Africa. *Library Hi-Tech*, 17(3), pp 285-298.

DARCH, C., RAPP, J. and UNDERWOOD, P.G. 1999. Academic library consortia in South Africa. *Library Consortium Management : an International Journal*, 1(1/2), pp 23-32.

DAVIDSON, E. J. 2005. *Evaluation methodology basics*, Thousands Oaks: Sage

DEWEY, M. 1886. Library co-operation, *Library Journal*, 11(5-6), pp 106-107.

DEY, I. 1993. *Qualitative data analysis: a user friendly guide for social scientists*, London: Routledge

DE KOCK, M.G. 1997. *An information technology infrastructure for resource sharing in South African academic information services*. D.Litt et Phil. Thesis, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg. (Unpublished).

ECHEA. 2006. ECHEA Website (Online) Available: <http://www.echea.ac.za> [Accessed: 23 October 2006]

EDWARDS, H.M. 1994. Library co-operation and resource sharing in South Africa: considerations for the future, *South African Journal of Library and Information Science*, 62(3), pp 113-116.

EDWARDS, H.M. 1998. Consortia: an overview, *Proceedings of the Conference on the Provision of Information in Southern Africa*, University of Pretoria, 20-22 August, 1998, Pretoria: Department of Information Science, pp 155-162.

EDWARDS, H. 1998. Fourteen parts make a whole: the GAELIC project, *Innovation*, 17, pp 15-20.

EDWARDS, H.M. 1999. South Africa's GAELIC: the Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium, *Information Technology and Libraries*, 18(3), pp 123-128.

EOM, S.B. 2005. Inter-organizational information systems in the Internet age, Hershey: IDEA Group Pub.

ERASMUS, L. 2005. Interview with Mrs. Lettie Erasmus, Pretoria: UNISA Library, 18 August 2005

FARAJPAHLOU, A.H. 1999. Defining some criteria for the success of automated library systems, *Library Review*, 48(4), pp 169-180.

FEATHER, J. and STURGES, P. 1997. *International encyclopedia of information and library science*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge

FLETCHER, P.D. and BERTOT, J.C. 2000. *World libraries on the information superhighway: preparing for the challenges of the new millennium*, Hersey: Idea Group Pub.

FRASCIELLO, M.J. and RICHARDSON, J. Distributed processing and Windows NT: the ideal infrastructure for library consortia, *Library Consortium Management: an International Journal*, 1(3/4), pp 76-83.

FRAWLEY, R. 2003. ELFNI (Electronic Libraries for Northern Ireland project): an overview, *Program: electronic library and information systems*, 37(2), pp 94-102.

FREEBODY, P. 2003. *Qualitative research in education: interaction and practice*. London: Sage.

FRELICO Website. [Online] Available:

<http://www.ufs.ac.za/faculties/content.php?id=3783andFCCode=12andDCCode=431>

[Accessed: 11 November 2006]

FROUD, R. 1999. The benefit of Foursite: a public library consortium for library management systems, *Program*, 33(1), pp 1-14.

GAELIC Profile 2003. [Online] Available: <http://www.gaelic.ac.za/profile> [Accessed: 11 October 2004].

GAELIC Website. [Online] Available: <http://www.gaelic.ac.za> [Accessed: June 2004]

GLATHORN, A.A. 1998. *Writing the winning dissertation: a step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

GLAZIER, J.D. and POWELL, R.R. 1992. *Qualitative research in information management*, Englewood: Libraries Unlimited

GORMAN, G.E. and CULLEN, R. 2000. Models and opportunities for library co-operation in the Asian region. *Library Management*, 21(7), pp 173-184.

GRAY, D.E. 2004. *Doing research in the real world*, London: Sage.

GREENE, D.J. 1996. INNOPAC Millennium: preparing libraries for the 21st century: a perspective and commitment, *Library Hi-Tech*, 14(4), pp 45-56.

GULATI, A. 2004. Use of information and communication technology in libraries and information centres: an Indian scenario, *The Electronic Library*, 22(4), pp 225-350.

HARROD, L.M. 1995. *Harrod's librarians' glossary: 9000 terms used in information management, library science, publishing, the book trade and archive management*. 8th ed. Aldershot: Gower .

HERNON, P. and ALTMAN, E. 1996. *Service quality in academic libraries*. Norwood: Ablex.

HERNON, P. and McCLURE, C.R. 1990. *Evaluation and library decision making*. Norwood: Ablex

HIRSHON, A. 1998. Libraries, consortia, and change management, *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 25(2), pp 124-126.

HIRSHON, A. 2001. International library consortia: positive starts, promising futures, *Journal of Library Administration*, 35(1/2), pp 147-166.

III, History of Innovative(Online), <http://www.iii.com/about.shtml> [Accessed: August 2005]

JALLOH, B. 1999. Library networking and consortia initiatives in Africa. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 9(1), pp 1-15.

JALLOH, B. 2000. A plan for the establishment of a library network or consortium for Swaziland: preliminary investigations and formulations, *Library Consortium Management: an International Journal*, 2(8), pp 165-176.

JOINT, N. 2006. Evaluating library software and its fitness for purpose, *Library Review*, 55(7), pp 393-402.

JORDAN, P. 1998. *The academic library and its users*. London: Gower.

KARGBO, J.A. 2002. African universities and the challenge of knowledge creation and application in the information age, *Library Review*, 51(8), pp 411-416.

KAUL, H.K. 1999. DELNET: an effective resource sharing model in India, *Library Management*, 8(6), pp 220-227.

KENT, A. and LANCOUR, H. 1972. (eds). *Encyclopedia of library and information science*. New York: Marcel Dekker.

KISIEDU, C.O. 1999. Barriers in using new information technology in document delivery in the Third World: prospects for the IFLA project in Ghana, *Interlending and Document Supply*, 27(3), pp 108-115.

KOPP, J. 1998. Library consortia and information technology: the past, the present, the promise. *Information Technology and Libraries*: 17(1), pp 7-12.

LANCASTER, F.W.1977. *The measurement and evaluation of library services*. Washington: Information Resources.

LANCASTER, F.W. 1988. *If you want to evaluate your library*. London: Library Association.

LELICO Website. [Online] Available: <http://www.lelico.org.ls> [Accessed: May 2005]

Lesotho Review: an overview of the Kingdom of Lesotho economy (2008), Maseru: Wabe: Publications.

LOR, P.J. and HENDRIKZ, F. 1993. Statistics of interlending traffic in the Southern African Interlending Scheme, 1985-1991, *South African Journal of Library and Information Science*, 61(1), pp 11-18.

MACDOUGALL, A.F. and PRYTHERCH, R. (edited). 1991. *Handbook of library co-operation*. Aldershot: Gower

MAKARA, M. 2002 Skills and competencies for the 21st century information professionals: a case of Lesotho, a paper presented at the 5th National Conference of the Library and Information Association of South Africa held in Port Elizabeth, South Africa, 30 Sept – 4 Oct 2002, (Unpublished)

MAN, D. and ERASMUS, L. 1998. Implementing a library system in a consortium: the GAELIC experience, *Proceedings of the Conference on the Provision of Information in Southern Africa*, University of Pretoria, 20-22 August, 1998, Pretoria: Department of Information Science, pp 134-136.

MARAIS, H. 2003. *Authority control in an academic library consortium using a union catalogue maintained by a central office for authority control*. (Unpublished thesis), Pretoria: University of South Africa

MASSIS, B.E. (edited) 2003. *Models of cooperation in U.S., Latin American and Caribbean Libraries: the first IFLA/SEFLIN International Summit on Library Cooperation in the Americas*, Munchen: K.G. Saur

MATTHEWS, J.R. 1980. *Choosing an automated library system: a library guide*, Chicago:ALA.

McCLURE, C.R. 1982. The planning process: strategy in action in *Strategies for library administration: concepts and approaches*, Littleton: Libraries Unlimited, pp 232-325.

McMILLAN, J.H. and SCHUMACHER, S. 1989. *Research in Education: a conceptual framework*. 2nd ed. Virginia: Harper Collins.

MERRETT, C. 1998. Tertiary library co-operation on the Eastern Seaboard: the case of ESAL, *Innovation*, 17, pp 27-30.

MILES, M.B. and HUBERMAN, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*, 2nd ed., Thousand Oaks: Sage.

MILLER, W. and PELLEN R.M. (edited) 2002. *Cooperative efforts of libraries*. London: Haworth Press

MOLEFE, C. 2003. Current developments in library cooperation among special libraries in Botswana, *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, 9(1), pp 62-70

MOULTON, J. 2001. *How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies: a South African guide and resource book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

MUTULA, S. 2004. IT diffusion in Sub-Saharan Africa: implications for developing and managing digital libraries, *New Library World*, 105(1202/1203), pp 281-289.

National University of Lesotho Library Website, Available Online [Accessed: March 2005] <http://www.nul.ls/library>

NFILA, R. B. and DARKO-AMPEM, K. 2002. Developments in academic library consortia from the 1960s to 2000: a review of literature. *Library Management*, 23(4/5), pp 203-212.

NFILA, R.B. 2005. Experience of systems migration at the University of Botswana Library: a case study, *Program: electronic library and information systems*, 39(3), pp 248-256.

NICHOLSON, S. 2004. A conceptual framework for the holistic measurement and cumulative evaluation of library services, *Journal of Documentation*, 60(2), pp 164 – 182.

ODINI, C. 1991. Problems and prospects of resource sharing in developing countries, *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 1(2), pp 93-98

ODINI, C. 1998. An overview of recent library and information developments in East Africa, *Library Management*, 19(1), pp 12-14.

O’FARRELL, J.P. 2000. Measuring performance with library automated systems, *Library Hi Tech*, 18(1), pp 75-81.

OSBORNE, L.N. and NAKAMURA, M. 2000. *Systems analysis for librarians and information professionals*. 2nd ed. Englewood: Libraries Unlimited.

PATHAK, S.K. and DESHPANDE, N. 2004. Importance of consortia in developing countries – an Indian scenario, *International Information and Library Review*, 36(3), pp 227-231.

PATTON, M.Q. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

PICKARD, A.J. 2007. *Research methods in information*. London: Facet Pub.

PILLING, S. and KENNA, S. (edited) 2002. *Co-operation in action: collaborative initiatives in the world of information*. London: Facet Publishing

PYE, J. and BALL, D. 1999. Purchasing consortia: trends and activity in the UK, *The Bottom Line: managing library finances*, 12(1), pp 12-18.

RAUBENHEIMER, J. 1998(a). GAELIC document delivery, *Proceedings of the Conference on the Provision of Information in Southern Africa*, University of Pretoria, 20-22 August, 1998, Pretoria: Department of Information Science, pp 123-133

RAUBENHEIMER, J. 1998(b). Interlibrary loans in new democratic societies – South African experiences, *Interlending and Document Supply*, 26(2), pp 70-75

ROSENBERG, D. 1993. Resource sharing – Is it the answer for Africa? *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science*, 3(2), pp 107-112.

ROSSI, P.H. and FREEMAN, H.E. 1985. *Evaluation: a systematic approach*. 3rd ed. Beverly Hills: Sage.

ROWLEY, J. 1980. *Computers for libraries*. 2nd ed. London: Clive Bingley.

ROWLEY, J. 1988. *The basics of information technology*. London: Clive Bingley.

ROWLEY, J. 1993. *Computers for libraries*, 3rd ed. London: Library Association

SEALS Website [Online] Available: <http://www.seals.ac.za> [Accessed: October 2006]

SNYDER, C.A. 2004. The role and future of consortia from the perspective of research library directors: an interview with Olivia M.A. Madison, Iowa State University Library, and James F. William II, University of Colorado, *Library Administration and Management*, 18(1), pp 4-7.

SUNDAY TIMES, 2005. Sunday Times Higher Education (Newspaper), 13 March 2005.

SWANSON, W. and MEYER, C. 1975. Design and evaluation of information systems, *Annual Research in Information Science and Technology*, (10), pp 41-101.

TANG, J. 2001. The new face of academic libraries in mainland China as they enter the twenty-first century, *Library Management*, 22(4/5), pp 181-186.

TAOLE, N. 2004. A scan of current information and communication technology initiatives in Lesotho: a report prepared for the Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa, (Unpublished).

UNDERWOOD, P.G. and SMITH G. 2005. GAELIC Institutional Member Survey, Unpublished.

VAN HOUSE, N.A., WEIL, B.T. and McCLURE, C.R. 1990. *Measuring academic library performance: a practical approach*. Chicago:ALA.

VAUGHAN, J. 2002. Preparing for technology: system planning and implementation in Lied library, *Library Hi-Tech*, 1, pp 33- 46.

VAUGHAN, J. 2004. A library's integrated online library system: assessment and new hardware implementation, *Information Technology and Libraries*, 23(2), pp 50-57.

WADE, R. 1999. The very model of a modern library consortium, *Library Consortium Management*, 1(1/2), pp 5-18.

WAGNER, W.E. 2007. Using SPSS for social statistics and research methods, Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press

WEECH, T.L. 2002. Back to the future – when resource sharing seemed to work. The rise and fall of a successful consortial resource sharing network, *Interlending and Document Supply*, 30(2), pp 80-86.

WELSH, B.W.W. and BUTORIN, P. 1990. (edited) Dictionary of Development: Third World Economy, Environment, Society, New York: Garland Pub.

WING-NGAO, H. 1998. A report on the Joint Symposium on Library and Information Science Studies, Zhongshan University, China, 29 March-2 April 1998, *Asian Libraries*, 7(10), pp 280-284.

WOODSWORTH, A. and WALL, T.B. 1991. *Library cooperation and networks: a basic reader*. New York: Neal-Schuman.

YAO, X, CHEN, L. and DAI, L. 2004. Current situation and future development of CALIS, *Library management*, 25(6/7), pp 277-282.

YIN, R.K. 1993. *Application of case study research*, Newbury Park: Sage.



YIN, R.K. 1994. *Case study research: design and methods*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Letter of Introduction for research student – Ms Nthabiseng Taole

Dear Library Director

Ms Nthabiseng Taole is a PhD student in the Department of Information Science at the University of Pretoria. She is conducting research on the INNOPAC library system in GAELIC and FRELICO, with a special focus on the Lesotho Library Consortium (LELICO).

She has now reached the stage where she wishes to administer the questionnaires and conduct interviews. I shall sincerely appreciate your assistance to her in this study, and thank you in anticipation.

Sincerely,

Professor Archie L Dick
(Promoter)

.

Appendix 2 **QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LIBRARY MANAGEMENT**

Research Topic: Performance evaluation of the INNOPAC library system in a consortium in a developing country: implications for the Lesotho Library Consortium

Researcher: Nthabiseng Taole

The aim of this research is to examine the value of the INNOPAC library system for GAELIC and FRELICO, and to find out to what extent this system is applicable to small consortia like the Lesotho Library Consortium. Please give the true picture of the situation in your library. Feel free to express your views and please do not write your name on the questionnaire.

Basic information:

Name of the library: -----

Pre-merger name, if applicable: -----

Date: -----

1. When did the library join GAELIC?

.....

2. Please list factors that motivated the library to join GAELIC

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. What have been the benefits of GAELIC membership for your library?

.....

.....

.....

.....

4. How strongly do you agree/disagree that the following factors contribute to the successful management of a consortium? Please tick the appropriate box.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Governance					



Funding					
Technology					
Common purpose					

4. How long has the library been using the INNOPAC library system?

.....

5. What system was used in the library before the INNOPAC library system?

.....

6. What were the reasons for changing to the INNOPAC library system?

.....

7. Please estimate costs relating to the system since its installation:

	Amount
Installation costs	
Running costs (hardware, software, etc.)	
Equipment (servers, etc.)	
Updates	
Training	
Staffing	
Others (specify)	
TOTAL	

8. What have been the benefits of the INNOPAC library system for your library?

.....

9. Please comment on the cost of the system against the benefits mentioned above



.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

10. How would you rate the system's impact on the following, on the scale of 1 to 5?
 1=lowest/poorest and 5=highest/best

	Rank
Increased productivity	
Improved customer service	
Access to GAELIC members' holdings	
Cost savings	
Decision making	

Comments:.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

11. What problems relating to the INNOPAC library system has your library encountered?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

12. How did you deal with those problems?



14. GENERAL COMMENTS

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

THANK YOU!

Appendix 3

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LIBRARY PROFESSIONALS

Research Topic: Performance evaluation of the INNOPAC library system in a consortium in a developing country: implications for the Lesotho Library Consortium

Researcher: Nthabiseng Taole

The aim of this research is to examine the value of the INNOPAC library system for GAELIC and FRELICO, and to find out to what extent this system is applicable to small consortia like the Lesotho Library Consortium. Please give the true picture of the situation in your library. Feel free to express your views and please do not write your name on the questionnaire.

Basic information:

Name of the library: -----

Section: -----

Date: -----

LIBRARY OPERATIONS

1. Please tick the INNOPAC library system module(s) that you use on a regular basis?

- Acquisitions
- Cataloguing
- Circulation
- Course Reserves
- OPAC
- Serials

2. Rate the performance of the module(s) you use:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Acquisitions					
Cataloguing					
Circulations					
OPAC					
Course reserves					
Serials					

Comments:.....
.....
.....



.....

3. Please rate system's **functionality** according to:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Availability					
Accessibility					
Reliability					
Security					

Comments:.....

4. Please rate the system's **usability**:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Ease of Use					
User-friendliness					
Error messages					
Help messages					

Comments:.....

SUPPORT AND TRAINING

5. Rate system's Support and training in terms of:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
User manuals					
Tutorials					
Initial training					
On-going training					
New releases/updates					

Comments:.....

5. Rate the quality of **system management** in terms of:



	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Accessibility					
Availability					
Helpfulness					
Response rate					

Comments:.....

6. Rate the **vendor** (Innovative) in terms of:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Accessibility					
Availability					
Helpfulness					
Response rate					

Comments:.....

7. Is your library a member of the following user groups?

a) Innovative User Group (Please tick) Yes No
 If the answer is 'Yes', how useful it to your section/department?
 (Please tick the answer)

Useful Average Not useful

If the answer is 'No', why?

.....

b) Do you subscribe to the Innovative User Group listserv?
 If you do, please comment on its value to your section/department

.....



If you don't, why?

.....
.....
.....
.....

c) Is your library a member of the INNOPAC User Group: Southern Africa Yes No
If the answer is 'Yes' – how useful is it to your section/department?

Useful Average Not useful

If the answer is 'No', why?

.....
.....
.....
.....

8. GENERAL COMMENTS: -----

THANK YOU!



Appendix 4

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Research Topic: Performance evaluation of the INNOPAC library system in a consortium in a developing country: implications for the Lesotho Library Consortium

Researcher: Nthabiseng Taole

The aim of this research is to examine the value of the INNOPAC library system for GAELIC and FRELICO, and to find out to what extent this system is applicable to small consortia like the Lesotho Library Consortium. Please give the true picture of the situation in your library. Feel free to express your views and please do not write your name on the questionnaire.

Basic information:

Name of the library: -----

Date: -----

1. For how long has the library been using the INNOPAC library system?

.....

2. Which system was in operation before the INNOPAC library system?

.....

3. What modules are available in your system?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. Which modules are not yet installed? And Why?



.....

5. Rate the system’s performance in terms of:

a) Library operations (please tick the appropriate box)

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Acquisitions					
Cataloguing					
Circulation					
OPAC					
Management Information					
Serials					
Others(specify)					

Comments:.....

b) System’s functionality

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Availability					
Accessibility					
Reliability					
Security					
Ability to integrate with other systems					
Ability to customise to own needs					
Upgradeability					



Comments:.....

c) Usage

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Ease of Use					
User-friendliness					
Error messages					
Help messages					

Comments:.....

6. Support and training

Rate system's support and training in terms of:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
User manuals					
Tutorials					
Initial training					
On-going training					
New releases/updates					

Comments:.....

7. Vendor

Rate the vendor (Innovative) in terms of:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Accessibility					
Availability					
Helpfulness					
Response rate					



Comments:.....
.....
.....
.....

8. Do you subscribe to the Innovative User Group listserv? Yes No
If yes, comment on its value to your Library

.....
.....
.....
.....

If not, why?

.....
.....
.....
.....

9. Is your library a member of the following user groups?

a) Innovative User Group (please tick) Yes No
If 'Yes' Comment on its value to your library

.....
.....
.....
.....

If 'No', why?

.....
.....
.....

b) INNOPAC User Group: Southern Africa Yes No
If 'Yes' Comment on its value to your library



.....

If 'No', why?

.....

c) Please comment on the value of the GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup to your library.

.....

9. Costs

Please estimate the following costs on the INNOPAC system:

Activity	Costs (in Rands)
Installation	
Initial training	
Ongoing training	
Licence per annum	
Others (specify)	

10. COMMENTS – Pitfalls and what to look out for during before during and after implementation

.....



.....
.....
.....

11. GENERAL COMMENTS

THANK YOU!

Appendix 5

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SYSTEM MANAGEMENT – OTHER SOUTHERN
AFRICAN LIBRARIES**

**Research Topic: Performance evaluation of the INNOPAC library system in a
consortium in a developing country: implications for the
Lesotho Library Consortium**

Researcher: Nthabiseng Taole

Basic information:

Name of the library: -----

Date: -----

1. For how long has the library been using the INNOPAC library system?

.....

2. Which system was in operation before the INNOPAC library system?

.....

3. What modules are available in your system?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. Which modules are not yet installed? And Why?

.....
.....
.....
.....



5. Rate the system's performance in terms of:

a) Library operations (please tick the appropriate box)

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Acquisitions					
Cataloguing					
Circulation					
OPAC					
Management Information					
Serials					
Others (specify)					

Comments:.....

b) System's functionality

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Availability					
Accessibility					
Reliability					
Security					
Ability to integrate with other systems					
Ability to customise to own needs					
Upgradeability					

Comments:.....

c) Usage

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
--	-----------	------	--------------	------	-----------



Ease of use					
User-friendliness					
Error messages					
Help messages					

Comments:.....

6. Support and training

Rate system's support and training in terms of:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
User manuals					
Tutorials					
Initial training					
On-going training					
New releases/updates					

Comments:.....

7. Vendor

Rate the vendor (Innovative) in terms of:

	Very poor	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Accessibility					
Availability					
Helpfulness					
Response rate					

Comments:.....

8. Do you subscribe to the Innovative User Group listserv? Yes No
 If yes, comment on its value to your Library



.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

If not, why?

.....
.....
.....

9. Is your library a member of the following user groups?

a) Innovative User Group (Please tick) Yes No
If 'Yes' Comment on its value to your library

.....
.....
.....
.....

If 'No', why?

.....
.....
.....

b) INNOPAC User Group: Southern Africa Yes No
If 'Yes' Comment on its value to your library

.....
.....
.....
.....

If 'No', why?



.....

.....

.....

c) Please comment on the value of the GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup to your Library.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

9. Costs

Please estimate the following costs on the INNOPAC System:

	Amount in Rands
Installation costs	
Running Costs (hardware, software, etc.)	
Equipment (servers, etc.)	
Updates	
Licence per annum	
Training	
Staffing	
Others (specify)	

10. COMMENTS – Pitfalls and what to look out for before, during and after implementation

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....



.....
.....
.....

11. GENERAL COMMENTS

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

THANK YOU!

Appendix 6

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LELICO LIBRARY HEADS

Research topic: Performance evaluation of the INNOPAC library system in a consortium in a developing country: implications for the Lesotho Library Consortium

Researcher: Nthabiseng Taole

The aim of this research is to examine the value of the INNOPAC library system for GAELIC, and to find out to what extent this system is applicable to small consortia like the Lesotho Library Consortium. Please give the true picture of the situation in your library. Feel free to express your views.

Name of the library: -----

Type of Library (please circle): Academic Special School Other (specify) -----

Date: -----

1. Please list the benefits that your library has derived from LELICO membership

2. Which other benefits would you like LELICO to provide?

3. Prioritise the following proposals for LELICO’s future plans, so that each proposal has a different value:

Proposal	Rank
Install a common library system for all members	
Expand membership	



Improve communication (newsletters, more meetings, etc.)	
Partner with other regional consortia	
Engage in fund raising activities	
Provide more professional development opportunities	

4. Is your library automated? (please circle the answer)

Yes No

If Not, why?-----

5. Which system is currently installed in your library?

6. Please tick modules used in your library

Acquisitions

Cataloguing

OPAC

Management Information

Serials

Others (please specify)-----

7. Which modules would you recommend for the LELICO common library system?

(please tick)

Acquisitions

Archives

Cataloguing



OPAC

Management Information

Serials

Others (please specify)-----

8. Please list any problems that you have encountered with your current system:

9. Rate the importance of the following for a common library system’s **functionality**:

(On the scale of 1 to 5, where 1=least important, 5= extremely important)

	Rating
Availability	
Accessibility	
Reliability	
Ability to customise to own needs	
Security of the system	
Possibility for upgrading	

10. Rate the importance of the following for a common library system’s **usability**:

(On the scale of 1 to 5, where 1=least important, 5= extremely important)

	Rating
User-friendliness	
Ease of use	



Error messages	
Help messages	

11. Rate the importance of the following for a common library system's **support**:
(On the scale of 1 to 5, where 1=least important, 5= extremely important)

	Rating
User manuals	
Tutorials	
Initial training	
Ongoing training	

12. Rate the importance of the following for a common library system's **vendor**:
(On the scale of 1 to 5, where 1=least important, 5= extremely important)

	Rating
Accessibility	
Availability	
Helpfulness	
Response Rate	

13. What has been the budget of the library for the past three years?

	2004	2005	2006
Amount in Maloti*			

* 1 loti = 1 Rand

14. Has the money allocated to the library been enough for its needs? (please tick)

Yes No



14. GENERAL COMMENTS:

THANK YOU!

Appendix 7

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

Research topic: **Performance evaluation of the INNOPAC library system in a consortium in a developing country: implications for the Lesotho Library Consortium**

Researcher: Nthabiseng Taole

1. Check the availability of the following modules:

- Acquisitions
- Cataloguing
- Circulations
- Management Information
- OPAC
- Serials
- Other

2. Check the availability of internet services

3. Check the availability of inter-library lending services

3. Observe any other electronic services available in libraries

4. Check how consortia members access other members' holdings

5. Check staffing in the systems section

Appendix 8

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
SYSTEM MANAGERS**

Background information:

Name of respondent:

Position held in your library:

Position held in consortium (if any):

Name of institution:

Date of interview:

1. General information:

When did your institution join the consortium?

How many institutions are members of the consortium?

Give reasons why your consortium/institution decided to use the INNOPAC library system.

2. Performance of the INNOPAC/Millennium Pac

Which modules have been installed in your system?

Comment on their performance

Comment on the general performance of the system in regards to:

Functionality (availability, accessibility, reliability, security)

Usability (ease of use, user friendliness, error messages, help messages)

Support and training (manuals, tutorials, initial training, ongoing training)

Vendor (accessibility, availability, helpfulness, response rate)

Comment on the management of the system?



Comment on the value of Innovative user groups and listserv?

Innovative User Group

Innovative User Group listserv

GAELIC INNOPAC Work Group

INNOPAC User Group: Southern Africa

How has the system contributed towards the performance of consortium member libraries?

Have you had any problems during and after implementation of the system?

If you had, how did you deal with those problems?

3. Decentralised server model

What has been your experience in using multiple servers within consortia?

What are the advantages and disadvantages of decentralised servers in your consortium?

What problems have you encountered this model?

What have done to solve those problems?

Comment on the cost versus the benefits of a central server model within a consortium?

What pitfalls should one look out for when implementing multiple servers within a consortium?

4. Staffing

How many people manage the system in your institution?

How are they funded?

6. Funding

Who funded the installation of the INNOPAC/Millennium library system in consortium/institution?

What was the cost (estimate) of implementing the INNOPAC library system?

Who takes care of the running costs of the system?

Have there been any unexpected costs?

If there have been, how have these been funded?

7. Resource sharing

Are there any resource sharing activities among consortium members?

Please describe them.

How has the common library system contributed towards resource sharing within your consortium?

Are any other resource sharing activities you would like the consortium to engage in?

Thank you very much for your time!

Appendix 9

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
SEALS PROJECT MANGER

Background information:

Name of respondent:

Position held in your library:

Position held in SEALS:

Name of institution:

Date of interview:

1. SEALS information:

When was SEALS formed?

How many institutions are members of SEALS?

Please name them and their type (academic, special, school, etc.)

Please describe the automation status of SEALS libraries before they converted to the INNOPAC/Millennium Pac library system

Give reasons why SEALS decided to use the INNOPAC library system.

2. Performance of the INNOPAC/Millennium Pac in SEALS

Which modules have been installed in your system?

Comment on their performance

Comment on the general performance of the system in regards to:

Functionality (availability, accessibility, reliability, security)

Usability (ease of use, user friendliness, error messages, help messages)

Support and training (manuals, tutorials, initial training, ongoing training)

Vendor (accessibility, availability, helpfulness, response rate)

Comment on the management of the system?

Comment on the value of Innovative user groups and listserv?

Innovative User Group

Innovative User Group Listserv

INNOPAC User Group: Southern Africa

Do you have any linkages with the GAELIC INNOPAC System Workgroup?

How has the system contributed towards the performance of consortium member libraries?

Have you had any problems during and after implementation of the system?

If you had, how did you deal with those problems?

3. Central server model

Where is the server located?

What has been your experience in using a central server?

What are the advantages of a central server model for SEALS?

Have you had any problems in using a central server for SEALS libraries?

What have done to solve those problems?

Comment on the cost versus the benefits of a central server model within a consortium?

What pitfalls should one look out for when implementing a central server within a consortium?

4. Staffing

How many people manage the server?

Are they employed by SEALS or by a member institution?

Who funds them?

5. Governance of SEALS and the common library system

Describe the governance of SEALS structure?

Is there any structure within SEALS that is responsible for the common library system?

If there is, describe its composition.

6. Funding

Who funded the installation of the INNOPAC/Millennium library system in SEALS?

What was the cost (estimate) of implementing the INNOPAC library system?

Who takes care of the running costs of the system?

Have there been any unexpected costs that relate to the central server?

If there have been, how have these been funded?

7. Resource sharing

Are there any resource sharing activities among SEALS libraries?

Please describe them.

How has the common library system contributed towards resource sharing within SEALS?

Are any other resource sharing activities you would like the consortium to engage in?

8. General

Is there any relevant document that you would like me to look at?

I appreciate the time you took for this interview. Is there anything else you think would be helpful for me to know about the central server model in a consortium?

Would it be alright to call you if I have more questions?

Thank you very much for your time!