

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD OCTOBER 6TH, 2022.

Location: physical (Prof. Oluwatope's office) and virtual (Google meet).

In attendance

1. Prof. A.O. Oluwatope - physical
2. Prof. I. Awoyelu - virtual
3. Prof. Bisi Bakare - physical
4. Dr. A. Ogunyemi - virtual
5. Dr. I.J. Diyaolu - virtual
6. Dr. Opayinka - virtual
7. Mr . E.A. Orisadare (Secretary) - virtual
8. Mr. E.O. Achukwu - virtual

Absent

1. Mrs. Eunice Ugwu (with an apology that she couldn't join due to network constraint)
2. Mrs. D. Adedeji.

Discussion

1. The meeting started around 12:05pm WAT with opening remarks from the principal investigator, Prof. Oluwatope.
2. Dr. Opayinka apologized for the delay in relaying the result of the reliability test. She noted that the task was outsourced and that the expert is currently having a challenge with his computer. She assured members that the result of the reliability test would soon be made available.
3. There was a debate on whether to get a reliability test for the research instrument before forging ahead with the research or to continue while other processes are ongoing. Dr. Opayinka advised that due to the time constraint, it is advisable to proceed with other activities. She noted that the feedback gotten from field researchers who participated in last test re-test can be used in fine-tuning the research instrument. She made some inquiries about the outcome of the last test re-test from the field

researchers. These include: What are the questions like? Has there been any improvement compared to the pilot test?

4. Dr. Ogunyemi stated that it is important to determine the reliability and validity of the research instrument. Reliability in terms of the consistency of the instrument and validity in that the instrument is able to measure exactly what it is intended to measure. He stated that the statistical results of the reliability test could have helped with this. However, since it isn't available at the moment, the project will have to rely on the feedback of the field researchers that participated in the test re-test.

5. Prof. Oluwatope welcomed the observations of the field researchers that participated in the test re-test research activity.

6. Dr. Diyaolu gave a report of his observations during the test re-test activity. He stated that the respondents were excited about the proposed application, though they were reluctant at first. He remarked that the incentives given to respondents also played a cogent role in facilitating quick and great responses from the correspondents. Dr. Diyaolu reported an aspect of the fashion design questionnaire which needed to be looked into (the headings of the questionnaire that stated that respondents may choose to refuse to answer any question that they don't want to). He explained that this might lead to incomplete responses from respondents as some respondents might actually choose not to respond. Dr. Diyaolu also advised that the proposed application should be named on the questionnaire as respondents often confuse the proposed application with other established social media platforms such as Facebook and Instagram.

7. Prof. Oluwatope welcomed name suggestions from members for the proposed social media platform. Names such as EcoTex and EcoDigiTex were suggested by the members.

8. Prof. Bakare gave her own account of the test re-test activity. She attributed most of the problems faced during the field activity to the absence of proper preparation or workshop before embarking on the task. She noted that the workshop could have helped in identifying these problems. Some of the issues she encountered while using the research instrument included duplicated questions, poorly captured variables, and ambiguous terminologies. Ambiguous in the sense that some questions in the fashion designer questionnaire are targeted towards the owner of the fashion design business, while other questions are targeted towards the employees.

9. Dr. Ogunyemi advised that solving this problem requires first determining the actual targets of the questionnaire. That is, is the questionnaire targeting the fashion design business owners or the fashion designers who are the employees? He also noted that there's a need to define some unclear terminologies in the questionnaire for easy understanding by the respondents. Further, Dr. Ogunyemi

suggested that separate questionnaires should be made for fashion business owners and their employees . This is to address individual stakeholders in the value chain.

10. Prof. Bakare agreed with the suggestion of Dr. Ogunyemi. She also stated the need to replace the term "income" on the fashion designer's questionnaire with "savings". Prof. Bakare also brought to notice the absence of the logistics section/industry in the questionnaire.

11. Dr. Opayinka stated that the absence of the logistics industry (transportation, insurance, and finance) in the instrument is due to the objectives of the research. Prof. Oluwatope emphasized the importance of the logistics industry to the research. Dr. Opayinka suggested that questions on the logistics stakeholders should be added to the questionnaire on the focus discussion group of each stakeholder. This is to avoid having a long list of questions that could bore the respondents. The members agreed with this.

12. Other established social platforms such as YouTube and Pinterest were included in the fashion design questionnaire. Also, several other corrections were made to the research instrument.

13. Prof. Awoyelu's submission/enquiries on field work was read out by Prof. Oluwatope. These includes

-How many days will be sufficient for the task?

-Photocopies of the research instruments should be given to field workers.

-Field researchers that are not present in Ile-Ife should be given money for the photocopy of the research instruments.

-Is the budget okay? -Are we using a digital (tablet) or paper approach?

14. Prof. Oluwatope sought the opinion of members experienced in the field of data collection. He also asked if it was necessary to use digital technologies such as tablets for data collection. Dr. Ogunyemi stated that the use of digital technology is subject to the agreed mode of data collection; that is, are the respondents going to fill out the questionnaire themselves or are they to be assisted by field researchers? Prof. Bakare noted that the initial arrangement was that the respondents were to be assisted in answering the questions by the field researchers.

15. Dr. Ogunyemi proposed a "mixed mode" for the data collection—respondents that can answer the questions themselves should be allowed to, while others that cannot should be assisted by the field researchers.

16. Dr. Diyaolu was selected by Prof. Oluwatope to team up with Prof. Bakare. They are both expected to come up with a proposal detailing the following aspects of the field work planning : date, recruitment, cost, training, study, and workshop.

17. Prof. Oluwatope reminded members of the upcoming workshop on review writing, which starts on the 10th of October. Dr. Ogunyemi noted that he is well prepared for this. He also promised to share some literature to be read by members before the commencement of the program .

18. Dr. Diyaolu suggested that an audio or video record of the workshop sessions would be of great help to members who might not be available.

19. In the absence of any other discussion, Prof. Bakare moved the motion for adjournment of the meeting and it was seconded by Mr. Achukwu.

20. The meeting was brought to an end at exactly 2:36 pm.