

Challenges and Prospects of Consortia: a Case Study of the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Ghana (CARLIGH)

PATIENCE DZANDZA AND ANABA ALEMNA



Patience Emefa Dzandza is the Assistant Librarian at the Akrofi-Christaller Institute of Theology, Mission and Culture, Akropong, Ghana. She holds the BA in Information Studies from the University of Ghana, Legon and MA in Library Studies from

the same University. She is presently enrolled in the M.Phil. programme in Information Studies at the University of Ghana.



Professor Anaba Alemna is a former University Librarian of the University of Ghana, and presently a Professor of Information Studies at the University of Ghana. He was the Chairman of the Consortium of Academic and Research

Libraries in Ghana (CARLIGH) from its inception until August, 2009. Professor Alemna has published extensively on libraries and librarianship worldwide. He is a Fellow of the Ghana Library Association and the Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences.

INTRODUCTION

In the current world of globalization, no individual organization and for that matter a library can afford to operate in isolation from other organizations in their industry. Many industries in order for them to share resources and ideas among their group members, and also to have a common front, tend to form cooperations. This

was the issue that prompted libraries to start forming consortia.

According to Nfila and Darko-Ampem (2002), historically, the common form of library cooperation was the sharing of union catalogue information, storage facilities, collection development, and human resources at local, national, and regional levels. Consortia are therefore formed to help share resources to reduce the cost of collection development in a single library and also bring about other benefits. These benefits are well expressed in the words of experts as follows.

Within contemporary academic libraries consortia are playing an increasingly important role. Bostick (2001) describes them as a 'way of life' for academic libraries. Landesman and Van Reenen (2000) state that consortia are an important avenue for the way academic libraries do business and also note that consortia are having 'profound programmatic and financial implications for most campuses'.

One of the primary purposes of consortia, listed in many articles, is the leveraging of library budgets to purchase more resources (mainly digital resources) than could be purchased by any one member institution (Rowse, 2003; Baker and Sanville, 2000; Alexander, 1999; Allen and Hirshon, 1998). The economic benefit of consortia lies in the ability of libraries to take their budgets further, spending less and getting more.

In addition to the economic gains, Maskell (2008) lists several 'non-economic' objectives for consortia memberships including: reducing redundancy and the duplication of work; leveling the playing field between the haves and 'have nots' by providing access to the same core resources; enabling shared services such as virtual reference and interlibrary loan; and providing opportunities for professional development, policy and standards development.

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF CONSORTIA

LIBRARY CONSORTIA IN AFRICA

In the whole of Africa, it is only South Africa which has made quite a serious effort in the formation of consortia. Currently, South Africa has five academic library consortia. These are;

- CALICO (Cape Library COoperative), in the economically strong greater Cape Town area;
- ESAL (Eastern Seaboard Association of Libraries), in Kwazulu-Natal;
- FRELICO (FREe State Libraries and Information CONSortium), in the Free State, with strong links to GAELIC;
- GAELIC (GAuteng and Environs LIBrary Consortium), based in Gauteng, South Africa's smallest but richest and most economically dynamic province;
- SEALS (South Eastern Academic Libraries' System), in the Eastern Cape, one of the country's poorest regions (Darch et al., 1999).

Even with this, given the socio-political context and the extraordinary changes that have occurred in South Africa in the 1990s, it is not surprising that the motivation to cooperate and the nature, intensity, and success of cooperation vary widely among the five major academic library consortia in South Africa. Again South Africa Consortia face numerous problems ranging from socio-political, language issues to telecommunication infrastructure (Darch et al., 1999).

THE SITUATION IN GHANA

Ghana is not left out when it comes to problems associated with library consortia formations. It was not until the 1990s that one bold attempt was made to set up a consortium in Ghana (Martey, 2004). This was the Ghana Interlibrary Lending and Document Delivery Network that operated actively between 1996 and 2002 with DANIDA funding.

In August 2004, the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries (CARLIGH, 2010) was formed. It has five working groups, namely Bibliographic Services, Information

Communication and Technology, Training, Information Marketing, and Electronic Information Services (Asare-Kyire and Asamoah-Hassan, 2006). Members are from public universities, private universities, research institutions, and one specialist training institution.

The Advisory Board of CARLIGH consists of representatives of Vice Chancellors of the public and private universities, the Director General of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, and the National Council for Tertiary Education. The Chairmen of the Governing Board of CARLIGH and the Management Committee of CARLIGH are member and member/secretary respectively. This Board is responsible for the provision of advice and lobbying for funds for the Consortium. It meets annually (<http://www.carligh.org.gh/carlighadmin.htm>).

The Governing Board of CARLIGH consists of Head Librarians of each participating institution and the Chairman of the Advisory Board. It is the think tank of the consortium. Its functions include the formulation of policies, approval of amendments to the constitution, approval of annual budgets and election of Management Committee members. One of the Head Librarians acts as Chairman on rotational basis for a period of two years. The Board meets twice a year.

Members of the Consortium have agreed that the following should be sources of funding (<http://www.carligh.org.gh/carlighadmin.htm>):

- Annual membership fee;
- Proceeds from Workshops/Conferences/Seminars;
- Other Donors;
- Government Grants.

CARLIGH is the only library consortium in Ghana. It seeks to bring libraries from academic and research institutions together to help harness resources to achieve a common goal of providing adequate information to their users. As at 2009, it had a membership of 18 different libraries from various parts of the country. Member libraries are: University of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology,

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF CONSORTIA

University of Cape Coast, University for Development Studies, University of Education, Ashesi University, Valley View University, Maranatha University College, Institute for Scientific and Technological Information, Wisconsin University College, Akrofi-Christaller College, University of Mines and Technology, Regional Maritime University College, Presbyterian University College, Ghana Telecom University, Kumasi Polytechnic, Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration and Takoradi Polytechnic.

They were therefore selected as subjects for the study, which was an academic exercise at the Department of Information Studies, University of Ghana, by the researchers with the view of bringing to the fore the immense value or benefits to be derived from joining existing library consortia or forming new ones.

The preamble to the constitution of CARLIGH states that CARLIGH has the purpose of ensuring a continued availability of library and information resources to the academic and research community in particular and the general public in Ghana. Their vision is to make available all recorded knowledge in all formats, first to the use of member institutions and then to the people of Ghana. Their mission is ultimately to employ selective information resources through available technology, old and new, and staff capabilities to improve teaching, learning and research, including lifelong learning, in member institutions and by extension in Ghana (The CARLIGH Constitution, 2004 cited from Asare-Kyire and Asamoah-Hassan, 2006).

According to Asare-Kyire and Asamoah-Hassan, the vision and mission statements of CARLIGH describe the transformative nature of an academic library consortium in bringing about development in quality research and learning in Ghana.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The questionnaires (see Appendix) were administered using the collective administration method (administering questionnaire to a captive audience) during the Association of

African Universities Conference in Accra in 2009 where CARLIGH representatives were present. The questionnaires were filled and submitted by the end of the 3-day conference. Two institutions which were not present at the conference had their questionnaires mailed to them.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Profile of the respondents from member institutions

Out of the 15 respondents, ten were females and four were males. One respondent did not indicate his or her gender. Libraries from which responses were solicited are as follows: Ashesi university library; CSIR-INSTI; Ghana Telecom University; GIMPA library; KNUST; University for Development Studies; University of Education and University of Ghana. Two of the respondents did not indicate the institutions in which they work. All respondents have worked with their current libraries between one year two months and 22 years. Thus the response rate for the questionnaire was 83.3% and almost all the respondents have long working experience in their various libraries.

Qualification of respondents

Out of the 15 respondents, one has a BA, one is a postgraduate, 10 have MA or its equivalent, two have M.Phil., and one has a Ph.D. In total 86.7% of the respondents have postgraduate degrees and 13.3% have first degrees. Out of the 15 respondents, ten of the respondents are Head Librarians, one is a Reference Librarian, one is a Senior Assistant Librarian and three are Assistant Librarians. Respondents have been working in their current positions between three months and ten years at the time responses were solicited. Respondents have worked as librarians between five and 44 years. This finding indicates that member libraries have been able to employ qualified library professionals to head their libraries, which means that the CARLIGH board is comprised of experienced librarians.

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF CONSORTIA

Knowledge of other consortia apart from CARLIGH

Out of the 15 respondents, only six making 40% of the respondents are aware of other consortia apart from CARLIGH. The ones mentioned are: Calico, Calin, Ohiolink, Aulc, Sherpa, Ifl, Inasp, Gaelic, Boston Library Consortium, Sabinet, Gildnet, Zulc, Lelico, Sanlic and Malico. The remaining 60% did not give any indication of their knowledge of other library consortia. From the above it can be said that the majority of the CARLIGH representatives are not aware of other external library consortia. This means that they might not be able to determine how library consortia have been helpful to other libraries in Africa and beyond.

Period of time a library has been part of CARLIGH

Out of the 15 responses, six libraries have been part of CARLIGH for five years, two libraries have been part of the consortium for four years; five libraries for three years; one library for two years; and one library for one and a half years. From this response, it can be realized that CARLIGH started with six of the respondents, had a growth rate of 33% in the year 2005; 62.5% in 2006; 7.7% in 2007 and 7.1% in 2008.

Reason for forming CARLIGH

In response to the question why CARLIGH was formed, 100% of the respondents indicated that it was formed to enhance cooperation to help reduce the cost of acquisition of electronic resources and the sharing of resources. Apart from this general view from the respondents, sections of the respondents gave other reasons why they think CARLIGH was formed. A section of the respondents representing 6.7% indicated that CARLIGH was formed to help enhance the profile of member libraries as they join. Another 13% said it was formed to help share ideas and expertise, and 6.7% of the respondents indicated that CARLIGH was to help establish relationships and to solve common problems.

This finding supports Nfila and Darko-Ampem's (2002) finding that, the main drive for cooperation has been the increase in the output of publications or the information explosion, the

rise in the cost of publications coupled with stringent budget allocations, and growth in student enrolment. There is also the increasing demand for service from customers together with the need to improve inter-lending services and the library collection, are additional factors.

This finding suggests that, though member libraries are aware of the reason why CARLIGH was formed, they have a narrow view on the aims it seeks to achieve, represented by the five working groups, namely Bibliographic Services, Information Communication and Technology, Training, Information Marketing, and Electronic Information Services. Thus members are abreast of the electronic information services but not very well of the others.

The finding also supports the basic idea that runs through the literature that consortia are formed to bring libraries together to engage in resource sharing or reduce some common costs. Also the findings support the view of Asare-Kyire and Asamoah-Hassan (2006) that library consortia should include programmes such as Shared Electronic Library System and Cooperative Collection Development, in order to meet the challenges of greater access to information. They further stated that cooperative collection development is also a major benefit in a consortium and in Ghana the benefits therefore will be overwhelming as the limitation and difficulty in tracing and getting access to information will be eliminated.

Reasons why a library joined CARLIGH

Reasons that were given by respondents for joining CARLIGH include the following: seven respondents representing 46.7% indicated that they joined in order to subscribe to and access electronic journals; three (20%) respondents joined to benefit from the training programme; two (13%) respondents indicated that they joined to share resources; one (6.7%) response was given for technical support; four (26.7%) respondents joined to share knowledge; six (40%) respondents joined to collectively acquire expensive resources; one (6.7%) respondent joined to enhance institutional profile; and one (6.7%) respondent joined to enhance the formation of a network of libraries. This is illustrated in Figure 1.

Reasons given	Number of respondents	Percentages
To subscribe to and access electronic journals	7	46.7%
To benefit from training programmes	3	20%
To share resources	2	13.3%
To receive technical support	1	6.7%
To share knowledge	4	26.7%
To collectively acquire expensive resources	6	40%
To enhance institutional profile	1	6.7%
To form a network of libraries	1	6.7%

Figure 1: Reasons for joining CARLIGH

From this response it can be deduced that the majority of the respondents (46.7%) joined to have access to electronic materials and another 40% joined to collectively acquire expensive resources. This indicates that libraries joined the consortium in order to acquire resources which they might not be able to acquire as individual institutions due to cost. The cost reduction factor brought in this finding strongly supports Nfila and Darko-Ampem's (2002) literature review, which showed that members of consortia posit that what brings libraries together is a desire to engage in resource sharing or reduce some common costs. And also the second reason they gave is 'to reduce the cost of member library operations by obtaining a group purchase price for information products'.

Nature of service provision before joining CARLIGH

In response to the question of the type of services the institutions provided before joining CARLIGH, 93% of the institutions indicated that they were providing traditional library services based on print resources. This type of service they said was no longer satisfactory to their clients as a lot of time was involved in searching for materials and that clients started demanding electronic-based resources as every aspect of the world was going electronic. The rest (6.6%) of the respondents indicated that they provided Internet services and CD-ROM services before joining and this was an expensive venture for them. This finding indicates that none of the member libraries was able to provide access to online databases

and online journals before CARLIGH came into existence in Ghana.

Nature of service provision after joining CARLIGH

All the respondents (100%) indicated that, in addition to print resources, they now provide services based on access to electronic journals and online databases after joining CARLIGH. They indicated in addition that this has improved service provision to their customers as they can access current resources online. Improvement in service provision also stems from the fact that users can now access more than one resource at a time and this saves users' time.

This finding is clearly supported by Asare-Kyire and Asamoah-Hassan (2006), that quality service can only be attained if there are adequate library services and resources. Resources such as electronic journals will enhance quality service as they offer current research information and findings in different academic disciplines. The currency of information provided by such journals would also keep users informed on various developments to help bridge the information gap. Consortia activities help easy access and rapid delivery of library materials to bridge gaps in information access.

New products and Resources shared by CARLIGH members

All the respondents (100%) indicated that as a CARLIGH initiative, they have access to electronic resources and they share these resources with other member libraries. Meanwhile, only

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF CONSORTIA

Benefits	Number of respondents	Percentages
Access to electronic resources at reduced cost	15	100%
Free training workshops	15	100%
Sharing of resources and knowledge	7	46.7%
Hyperlink from CARLIGH website	5	33.3%
Interlibrary lending	2	13%
More support for academic libraries from vice chancellors due to their membership status.	3	20%
Technical support	5	33.3%

Figure 2: Benefits derived from joining CARLIGH

one institution (6.7%) indicated that it shares resources through interlibrary lending.

This finding clearly indicates that though consortia activities are supposed to help enhance sharing of all forms of resources, CARLIGH members mostly share the online databases and journals and not other resources such as the print resources. This might be because of the issue identified by Alemna and Cobblah (2004, pp.7-8), who discussed the problems of library cooperation in Ghana, that the non-availability of communication facilities such as good road networks and telephone and postal systems has an adverse effect on any meaningful cooperative venture since the transfer of resources will not be that easy. Secondly, they also indicated that most libraries do not have comprehensive collections adequate enough to share with other libraries and this makes cooperation difficult.

Benefits derived from joining CARLIGH

Respondents indicated the following (Figure 2) as the benefits they derive from joining CARLIGH:

Figure 2 shows that all respondents (100%) get access to electronic resources at reduced cost. All respondents again indicated that they benefit from free training workshops. Seven representing 46.7% indicated that they benefit from resources and knowledge sharing. Five (33.3%) said their websites are linked by hyperlink from the CARLIGH website. Two (13%) said they benefit from interlibrary lending. Three (20%) said through CARLIGH they now receive more support for their academic libraries from vice

chancellors due to their membership status. Five (33.3%) indicated technical support as a benefit they receive from CARLIGH.

This finding supports Asare-Kyire and Asamoah-Hassan's (2006) suggestion that library consortia should include programmes such as Shared Electronic Library System, Cooperative Collection Development, Document Delivery, Reciprocal Borrowing, and Human Resource Development in order to meet the challenges of greater access to information.

Resources acquisition method

Out of the 15 respondents, 13 (86.7%) indicated that they acquire their print resources locally or internally while they acquire electronic databases collectively with other CARLIGH members. Two (13.3%) respondents did not provide any answer to this question.

The collective acquisition of electronic databases and online resources by member libraries is a good feature of the collaborative effort that CARLIGH seeks to achieve.

Method of sharing cost

Out of the 15 respondents, 13 (86.7%) indicated that the cost of resources is shared equally among member libraries, one (6.7%) respondent indicated that affiliate members pay a fixed amount and full members share cost equally, one (6.7%) respondent also indicated that cost is shared according to access time to relevant databases.

From the above responses, it can be realized that, though 86% of the respondents indicated

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF CONSORTIA

Problems indicated	Number of respondents	Percentages
Breakdown of Internet	5	33.3%
Difficulties in dealing with the publishers	6	40%
A lot more to learn as staff	4	26.7%
Difficulty in accessing some of the databases	8	53.3%
Not getting full access to all articles in databases	10	66.7%
Subscription procedures to electronic resources difficult	5	33.3%
Inability of sub-committees to meet	3	20%
Late release of funds from mother institution	4	26.7%
Electronic resources not relevant to the needs of members	6	40%
Foreign exchange	9	60%
Increasing cost of electronic resources	7	46.7%
Disagreement among members	10	66.7%

Figure 3: Problems members encounter (There were multiple responses to this question)

that the cost of electronic resources is shared equally among members, the remaining 13.3% give contradictory responses which may imply that the mode of sharing cost is not clear enough for members to understand.

Problems encountered by member libraries

Respondents gave the following as the problems they encounter as CARLIGH members: 33.3% indicated the breakdown of the Internet. 40% have difficulties in dealing with the publishers. 26.7% said they have a lot more to learn as staff. 53.3 % have difficulty in accessing some of the databases. 66.7% said they do not get full access to articles. 33.3% said the subscription procedures to electronic resources are difficult. 20% expressed their concern at the inability of sub-committees to meet. 26.7% said they do not receive funds from their mother institutions on time. 40% of the respondents said many of the electronic resources are not relevant to the courses offered in some institutions. 60% of the respondents find it difficult to access foreign exchange. 46.7% indicated the increasing cost of electronic resources and 66.7% of the respondents indicated that there is usually disagreement among members. Four institutions did not indicate any reasons. (There were multiple responses to this question). The above

problems revealed through the study, serve as evidence for the comment made by the researchers in their statement of the problem that, despite CARLIGH's ambitions, it is faced with numerous problems ranging from financial constraints, lack of cooperation among members, lack of commitment of member institution and above all lack of good technical infrastructure (ICT) to support its services. Figure 3 shows the number of respondents who indicate a particular problem.

Future Prospects of CARLIGH

Formation of CARLIGH as a good initiative

In response to the question whether the formation of CARLIGH is a good initiative, all respondents affirmed to this. Five (33.3%) of the respondents indicated that it gives smaller libraries the chance also to get electronic resources; six (40%) said it enables libraries to share information; all respondents (100%) affirm that the formation of CARLIGH is a good initiative because it enhances access to electronic resources at reduced cost; 13 (86.7%) of the respondents said it serves as a platform to pool resources together; all respondents (100%) again indicated that it helps them to attend free workshops to share knowledge; 10 (66.7%) said it has brought most of the academic libraries together. Figure 4

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF CONSORTIA

Reasons given	Number of respondents	Percentages
It gives smaller libraries the chance also to get electronic resources	5	33.3%
It enables libraries to share information	6	40%
It enhances access to electronic resources at reduced cost	15	100%
Serves as a platform to pool resources together	13	86.7%
The attendance of workshops to share knowledge	15	100%
It has brought most of the academic libraries together	10	66.7%

Figure 4: CARLIGH formation a good initiative (There were multiple responses to this question)

Forms of training suggested	Number of respondents	Percentages
Copyright management	3	20%
Institutional repositories	8	53.3%
ICT training	10	66.7%
Long-term courses	2	13.3%
Management training	7	46.7%
Scholarly publishing	4	26.7%
Use of Web 2.0 technology	2	13.3%

Figure 5: Forms of training suggested by members (There were multiple responses to this question)

shows the reasons given by the respondents. This goes to prove that the formation of CARLIGH is a good initiative and the number of respondents that indicated a particular reason.

This finding can be linked with the findings by Maskell (2008) in a study carried out in Canada which indicated that consortia activity has positively affected the relationship amongst academic libraries. The most common effects noted were that consortia activity brings libraries closer together, it lets them know each other better with respect to each other's goals, operations and problems, and it increases opportunities for dialogue and shared projects. The findings from this study and that of Maskell confirm that consortia activity has increased the trust between academic libraries and made them 'think consortially' as a part of their daily operations. This finding also supports the theoretical framework chosen by the researchers which indicates that joint action will reduce the organizations' costs and cooperation will increase the organizations' power successfully to accomplish the changes they desire.

Training opportunities provided by CARLIGH

The respondents indicated the following forms of training: capacity building in new library trends, ICT training, information literacy, use of databases, web design, customer service, workshops and seminars on current library development. The result shows that CARLIGH is paving a way for better human resource development in the library field through training opportunities. This finding is what Asare-Kyire and Asamoh-Hassan referred to when they said that consortia activities should include Human Resource Development in order to meet the challenges of greater access to information.

Other forms of training suggested by members

Respondents indicated that CARLIGH should provide further training in the following areas: copyright management, institutional repositories, ICT training, long-term courses, management training, scholarly publishing, training in publishing education, and use of Web 2.0 technology.

Figure 5 shows that 66.6% of the respondents want to be trained in ICT, 53.3% would also like

Reasons given	Number of respondents	Percentages
Training members receive to equip staff with skills	10	66.7%
Increased access to shared resources	12	80.0%
Availability of information	13	86.7%
Development of the spirit of cooperation	5	33.3%
Teaching of new library trends for librarians to gain knowledge	14	93.3%
Service provision based on electronic resources	15	100.0%
Enhancement of resources sharing between large and small libraries	6	40.0%

Figure 6: CARLIGH as a source of improvement of library services (There were multiple answers to this question)

to be trained in institutional repository development and 46.7% would also like to undergo management training. Though other forms of training have been indicated by members, it can be deduced from the responses that member institutions are aware of the benefits that ICT, institutional repository building and management can bring to a consortium, as these three received the highest ranking.

CARLIGH as a source of improvement of library services

All respondents (100%) indicated that the activities of CARLIGH will improve library services due to the training members receive to equip staff with skills, increased access to shared resources, availability of information, development of the spirit of cooperation, teaching of new library trends for librarians to gain knowledge, service provision based on electronic resources, and enhancement of resource sharing between large and small libraries. Figure 6 shows the reasons given and the number of respondents who gave a particular reason.

Figure 6 shows that 66.7% of the respondents indicated that CARLIGH will improve library services due to the training members receive to equip staff with skills. 80% said this will happen because of increased access to shared resources. 86.7% mentioned availability of information as a factor. 33.3% mentioned development of the spirit of cooperation. 93.3% indicated that service provision will improve through teaching of new library trends for

librarians to gain knowledge. 100% were sure that due to service provision based on electronic resources CARLIGH will improve library services in the country and another 40% mentioned the enhancement of resource sharing between large and small libraries as a feature of CARLIGH which will help improve library services in the country.

Though respondents gave different reasons for thinking that library services can be improved by CARLIGH through its activities, there is no doubt that they are all aware that the activities of CARLIGH will help improve library service delivery in the country. This goes to support the idea that cooperative activities such as consortia are formed to help improve service delivery. As indicated by Bopp and Smith (2001, pp. 16-17), library consortium formation is an attempt by all kinds of libraries to improve their services to their users through cooperative activities in collection development, reference services, and document delivery.

Other cooperative activities members undertake

In an attempt to outline other cooperative activities members undertake, all respondents indicated knowledge sharing and capacity building, information and knowledge sharing, training programmes, workshops and seminars. Only five (33.3%) respondents indicated interlibrary lending and document delivery as one of their cooperative activities. This finding also supports the idea of Bopp and Smith (2001) that library consortia are attempts by all kinds of libraries

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF CONSORTIA

Reasons given	Number of respondents	Percentages
Access to more databases	14	93.3%
Access to publications of other institutions	13	86.7%
Availability of documents and other digital resources to members	10	66.7%
Concentration of research reports at one spot for dissemination	14	93.3%
Will increase the number of resources that will be available at reduced cost	12	80.0%

Table 7: Benefit of Open Access to CARLIGH (There were multiple responses to this question)

Reasons given	Number of respondents	Percentages
Consortia formation is the trend of the day	9	60%
It helps members share ideas	12	80%
It serves as a common platform for member libraries	7	46.7%
It supports young libraries	9	60%
It gives training	14	93.3%
Libraries pay less for more	15	100%
It has improved library services	6	40%
It eases the financial burden of members	14	93.3%
It has increased resource-sharing and networking	12	80%

Table 8: Reasons why CARLIGH should continue (There were multiple responses to this question)

to improve their services to their users through different cooperative activities such as collection development, reference services, and document delivery.

Benefit of Open Access to CARLIGH

From Figure 7 it is realized that 93% of the respondents indicated that the open access initiative by CARLIGH will enhance access to more databases. 86% said it will help access publications of other institutions. 66.6% said it will promote availability of documents and other digital resources to members. 93.3% said it will help concentration of research reports at one spot for dissemination, and another 80% said it will increase the number of resources that will be available and accessible to members at reduced cost. The result shows that members see the Open Access policy as a good opportunity for CARLIGH members as it will serve as an institutional repository to all members.

Reasons why members want CARLIGH to continue its operations

All respondents want CARLIGH to continue its services because, as shown in Figure 8, apart from the cooperative ventures, 60% think consortia formation is the trend of the day. 80% said it helps members share ideas. 46.6% said it serves as a common platform for member libraries. 60% said it supports young libraries. 93.3% indicated that it gives training. 100% of the respondents indicated that libraries pay less for more and are introduced to new developments. 40% said it has improved library services and 93.3% said it eases the financial burden of members. 80% said it has increased resource-sharing and networking and also they want it to continue to offer technical cooperation and to promote more capacity building activities. From all indications, member institutions have realized the importance of library consortia and would like CARLIGH to continue with its services.