

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The overall library development project deals with 3 phases, namely; (1) defining a library vision, mission and performance indicators; (2) undertaking a needs assessment; and (3) conducting a strategic planning workshop to identify problem-solving strategies.

- Defining vision, mission and performance indicators

To arrive at a vision and mission statement and key performance indicators a Library Development Committee was convened. This committee conducted a rapid assessment including a review of related literature, the academic library guidelines, the EQA directives and the Mahidol University requirements as well as interviews with key stake holders within the college. The Library Development Committee, then, developed a vision and mission statement and a set of key performance indicators.

- Needs assessment

This study concentrates on phase-2, i.e., the needs assessment. The needs assessment required to employ both qualitative and quantitative methods.

- Strategic work shop

The results and conclusions of this study, the needs assessment, will then be used as an input to the problem-solving process which will be facilitated by a strategic planning workshop conducted by the Library Development Committee.

3.2 Needs Assessment

- Study Design

The study design of the needs assessment is cross-sectional and consists of three steps, namely; (1)identifying possible needs; (2)prioritizing needs; and (3)selecting needs to be addressed.

(1) Identifying possible need

Based on the identified vision and mission statement as well as the key performance indicators, the Library Development Committee conducted a rapid assessment as a review of the current situation including a self-administered open-ended questionnaire, in-depth interviews and a focus group discussion and then organized a series of consensus panel discussions to arrive at a set of possible needs that would then be used as an input to the development of a structured questionnaire for a survey among College faculty and students for prioritizing needs.

(2) Prioritizing needs

The set of identified possible needs were used to develop a structured questionnaire for prioritization of needs among two key stakeholder groups namely College faculty and students.

After the questionnaire survey, in-depth interviews were conducted with library users.

(3) Selecting needs to be addressed

Based on the survey results, the Library Development Committee again conducted a series of consensus panel discussions to select those needs that have to be addressed by the library development project. Final adjustment was exercised on those needs which were rated high on importance and low on current availability. Other indicators, such as feasibility, budget limitations and the requirements defined by the Academic Library Standard guidelines, the EQA regulations and the Mahidol University regulations were applied as well.

3.3 Population and Sampling

Self-administered Open-ended Group Questionnaire (step one :defining possible needs)

Purposive sampling was used to select the respondents based on the following criteria:

Being current students of the 4 education programs (i.e. Bachelor of Public Health, Certificate of Community Health, Certificate of Dental Public Health and Certificate of Pharmacy Technic)

One questionnaire sent to each classroom of all study years in each program (i.e. 4 Bachelor of Public Health, 2 Certificate of Community Health, 2 Certificate of Dental Public Health and 2 Certificate of Pharmacy Technique)

The total was 10 questionnaires of class perceptions.

- Being current faculty of the 4 education programs (i.e. Bachelor of Public Health, Certificate of Community Health, Certificate of Dental Public Health and Certificate of Pharmacy Technique) which divided into 4 departments (i.e. Community Health Department, Dental Public Health Department, Pharmacy Department and Human Resource Development Department)
- One questionnaire sent to each department (i.e. Community Health Department, Dental Public Health Department, Pharmacy Department and Human Resource Development Department)

In total 4 questionnaires of department perceptions.

In-depth Interview-1 (step one: defining possible needs)

Purposive sampling was used to select the respondent for the single in-depth interview, namely the librarian.

Focus Group Discussions-1 (step one: defining possible needs)

Purposive sampling was applied to select focus group discussion participants based on the following criterion:

- Classroom heads of all years in each program (4 BPH, 2CCH, 2CDPH and 2CPT) with the of 10 students.

Focus Group Discussions-2 (step one: defining possible needs)

Haphazard sampling was used to select focus group discussion participants based on the following criteria:

- Having enrolled as SCPH-C students
- Using the library at the time of organizing the FGD
- Willing to participate

The total were six student-participant divided into two males and four females. They included three from BPH program, two from CCH program and one from CPT program respectively.

The Library Development Committee

Purposive sampling was applied to compose the Library Development Committee based on the following criteria:

- Being library staff.
- Being faculty member of one of the 4 education programs and in charge of student activities.

The LDC consisted of 1 librarian and 10 faculty members.

The survey (step two: prioritizing needs)

For the survey using a structured questionnaire, two key stakeholder groups were included, namely, College faculty and enrolled students from the four education programs organized by the College during 2003. For faculty as well as for students the total population was included for the survey. In total 44 faculty members and 517 students were included in the survey.

In-depth Interview-2 (step two: prioritizing needs)

Purposive sampling was used to select respondents for in-depth interviews among student respondents of the self-administered structured questionnaire. There are those who raised unclear suggestions in the suggestion part of the self-administered structured questionnaire. In total, ten respondents were selected, consisting of 4 from BPH program, 3 from CCH program, 1 from CDPH program and 2 from CPT program.

3.4 Instrumentation

Phase-2 Step-1 : Identifying needs

- A self administered open- ended questionnaire was used among student and faculty groups.
- For the in-depth interview, a series of open-ended questions was used to guide the discussion with the librarian.
- For the focus group discussions, a set of open-ended questions was used to guide the discussions.
- Based on the outcomes of Phase-1 and the open-ended questionnaire among students in Phase-2.

- Step-1 question statements were developed to guide discussion among the consensus panel.

Phase-2 Step-2 : Prioritizing needs.

- For the survey among faculty and students, a self administered structured questionnaire was used.
- For the in-depth interviews, a series of open-ended questions was used to guide the discussion with students.

Questionnaires were checked for content and face validity by 3 experts consist of ;1.Dr.Kraisorn Chairojkarnjana; 2.Dr Quanchadin Pisarnpong; and 3. Miss Sureerat pinthong. The structured questionnaire was developed in Thai language and translated into English solely for the purpose of the thesis report. Questionnaire reliability was tested through a pre-test with 30 students using the Cronbach's test to examine interval consistency and Alpha was 0.95

Phase-2 Step-3 : Selecting needs.

Based on the outcomes of Phase-2 Step-2, question statements were developed to guide the discussion among the consensus panel.

3.5 Measurement

Identifying needs

The independent variables were: (1) Academic Library standards, (2) EQA criteria, (3) Mahidol University requirement, (4) Vision and mission statement, (5) Key

performance indicators and (6) Perceptions of students and the LDC members, while the dependent variable was (1) possible need.

Prioritizing needs

The independent variables were: (1) Faculty and (2) Student perceptions: while the dependent variable were: (1) Information resources, (2) Facilities, (3) Physical environment, (4) Service and (5) Staff.

Selecting needs

The independent variables were: (1) Faculty and (2) Student perceptions on priority needs,(3) Library standards.(4) Budget limitations and (5) Perceptions of Library Development Committee members; while the dependent variable was (1) Selected needs.

Comparisons

For the questionnaire survey to prioritize needs, respondents were classified into 2 main groups (1) faculty and (2) students. Students were then classified into sub-categories by their educational programs. Comparison was applied to identify possible variations in frequencies.

Survey results were also compared with panel discussion and in-depth interview outcomes to validate the findings.

In-depth interviews' outcomes were compared to identify possible variations or discrepancies in perceptions.

3.6 Procedures

Approval was obtained from the College management to conduct the needs assessment. The questionnaire survey and in-depth interviews as well as the panel discussions were organized at the College.

Collaboration of coordinating faculty members for each of the educational programs was obtained to conduct the questionnaire survey among students.

Oral consent was sought from each respondent prior to giving them a clear written consent statement in each questionnaire.

3.7 Data Analysis

Quantitative data:

Quantitative data derived from the survey were used for a descriptive analysis employing descriptive statistics. Responses were entered in to the computer with a randomly selected sample validated by double entry.

Data were analyzed using the SPSS software program to determine frequencies and percentages. The Chi- Square test was used to identify statistically significant differences for the two main groups(faculty and students) as well as for the sub-categories among students.

Qualitative data:

Analysis of qualitative data was based on issue analysis facilitating discovery of regularities, comprehension of meaning and reflection. Outcomes were triangulated among the various in-depth interview respondents as well as with focus group discussion outcomes for cross validation.