Abstract

Collaboration between academic and library faculty is an important topic of discussion and research among academic librarians. Partnerships are vital for developing effective information literacy education. The research reported in this paper aims to develop an understanding of academic collaborators by analyzing academic faculty’s teaching social network. Academic faculty teaching social networks have not been previously described through the lens of social network analysis. A teaching social network is comprised of people and their communication channels that affect academic faculty when they design and deliver their courses. Social network analysis was the methodology used to describe the teaching social networks. The preliminary results show academic faculty were more affected by the channels of communication in how they taught (pedagogy) than what they taught (course content). This study supplements the existing research on collaboration and information literacy. It provides both academic and library faculty with added insight into their relationships.

Introduction

For this study collaboration between academic and library faculty has been investigated by analyzing the teaching social networks of academic faculty at a community college. This investigation supplements the existing research on collaboration for higher education and provides both academic and library faculty with added insight into their relationships. Academic faculty teaching social networks have not been previously described through the lens of social network analysis. This paper thus explores the nature of a teaching social network and focuses on the roles of communication channels in academic faculty’s teaching social networks.

Background / Literature Review

When academic faculty design and deliver their courses they are engaged in a teaching social network. A teaching social network, a new term created for this study, is comprised of people and their communication channels that affect academic faculty when they design and deliver their courses. Communication channels are formal (e.g., scholarly journals and professional development activities) and informal (e.g., personal communication) (Weedman, 1992). An example of a communication channel included in a teaching social network is involvement in team teaching. Through team teaching faculty members become a part of each other’s teaching social network. They influence each other in the way they design and deliver the team taught course. Another example of a communication channel in an academic faculty’s teaching social network is the process of collaboration when developing assignments with library faculty. The role for library faculty here is to explain search strategies, show how to locate, evaluate, and analyze information related for class assignments. A third example of a communication channel is attendance at professional workshop or reads a professional journal on pedagogy.

Collaboration

Educational theorists have promoted collaboration among faculty as a method to advance intellectual and practical student learning (Haycock, 2007; Lewis & Sincan, 2009). Collaboration through shared goals and objectives between faculty “improves teaching and strengthens academic programs” (Lindman & Tahamont, 2006). It is argued that when academic faculty members collaborate, students benefit from the collaboration by recognizing the connections across or within disciplines (Lewis & Sincan, 2009). Ideas transfer from one course to another as a result of the collaboration (Lewis & Sincan, 2009). Students are exposed to the unique perspectives and strengths of different participating faculty members (Lewis & Sincan, 2009). The experiences of collaboration help faculty to gain knowledge in each other’s area of expertise and remove perceived barriers between departments (Lindman & Tahamont, 2006).
Information Literacy Education

Collaboration between academic faculty and library faculty is often conducted for information literacy education. Library faculty argue that collaboration between library and academic faculty is imperative in teaching the concepts of information literacy to students (England & Pasco, 2004). Information literacy education helps students grasp concepts and apply them in multiple disciplines (Barnard, Nash, & O'Brien, 2005). Library faculty believe building partnerships with academic faculty should be their key strategy for teaching information literacy concepts to students (Zhang, 2001).

Information literacy is usually described as the ability to locate, evaluate, and utilize information (ACRL Information Literacy Advisory Committee, September 29, 2006; American Library Association Presidential Committee on Information Literacy, 1989; Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, 2003). Information literacy is commonly identified as an outcome of a community college education. The governing authorities for community colleges, also known as accreditation organizations, recognize information literacy as a student learning outcome and standard that must be met and stressed that collaboration between academic and library faculty is a strategy for meeting this standard (Saunders, 2008). Because of the widespread acceptance of information literacy as a part of higher education, a major theme in the library and education literature has been the need for academic and library faculty to work together (ACRL Information Literacy Advisory Committee, May 22, 2008; Andretta, Pope, & Walton, 2008; Bruce, 1997, 2004; England & Pasco, 2004; Gandhi, 2004; Li, 2007; Mackey & Jacobson, 2005; Sciammarella, 2009; Thompson, 2002; Wijayasundara, 2008; Winner, 1998). When academic and library faculty collaborate together library faculty become a part of academic faculty’s teaching social network.

Teaching Social Network

Social networks are groups of people that have common interests, interact with each other, and exchange information between members (Zohar & Tenne-Gazit, 2008). Some examples of personal social networks are family, friends, graduate school, and work. Social networks significantly impact daily lives (Marshall & Foster, 2002; Ribeiro, Paúl, & Nogueira, 2007) and are dynamic throughout life. The social network that this study addresses is a teaching social network. A teaching social network is a term used to identify one of the personal social networks of academic faculty that affects the way they design and deliver their courses. This term has been created for this study and has not been identified in library or education literature.

As described earlier a teaching social network is comprised of people and their communication channels that affect academic faculty when they design and deliver their courses. The teaching social network connects people together through collaboration.

Significance of Research

The importance of collaboration between academic and library faculty has been illustrated in the library and education literature (ACRL Information Literacy Advisory Committee, May 22, 2008; England & Pasco, 2004; Winner, 1998; Zhang, 2001). However, academic faculty does not always accept library faculty as integral when developing course curriculum (Arp, Woodard, Lindstrom, & Shonrock, 2006; Winner, 1998). Library faculty are thought of as supportive but not an essential part of the learning process (Winner, 1998). In order to build more successful collaborations, it has been claimed that library faculty need to understand “academic faculty culture” and how to communicate more effectively with academic faculty (Rabinowitz, 2000).

There is a significant body of research dedicated to collaboration between academic and library faculty (Bowler & Street, 2008; Callison, Budny, & Thomes, 2005; Carter & Daugherty, 1998; Cochrane, 2006; Corrall, 2008; Donham & Green, 2004; Elrod & Somerville, 2007; Ferrer-Vincent & Carello, 2008; Matthew & Schroeder, 2006; Matthies, 2004; Prucha, Stout, & Jurkowitz, 2005; Thaxton, Facioli, & Mosby, 2004; Thompson, 2002). However, the existing research does not investigate collaboration utilizing social network analysis from an academic faculty member’s teaching social network perspective. Instead the library and education literature explored the influencers affecting academic faculty when they designed or delivered their courses (Auman & Lillie, 2008; Benton & Schillo, 2004; Briggs, 2007; Lindsay, Jeffrey, & Singh, 2009).

Research Problem and Research Questions

The overall research question of the study is: What is the nature of the teaching social networks of academic faculty? The sub-research questions that will be discussed in this paper are: What channels of communication affect academic faculty when they collaborate and design and deliver their courses? To what extent do the channels of communication affect academic faculty? In addressing the sub-research questions this paper will develop an understanding of collaboration from the perspective of academic faculty.
Methodology

Social network analysis was the quantitative method chosen for this study to examine academic faculty’s teaching social network. Social network analysis was appropriate as a methodology for this study because it identified the structure of a social network through sets of people or groups and their relationships that drew them together (Marin & Wellman, June 11, 2009; Tindall & Wellman, 2001; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). Social network analysis examined the relationships between social units like people or groups (Wasserman & Faust, 1994, p. 3). Social network analysis was also described as research into social relationships and the results that occur because of the existence of the relationships (Tindall & Wellman, 2001). A main priority of social network analysis was to develop an understanding of how social relationships support and impede individuals in their actions (Tindall & Wellman, 2001).

Software for social network analysis data

Software was used to analyze the collected social network data. The software used for this study was VisuaLyzer because of the ease of use in creating social network analysis diagrams. There was an additional analysis done of the Excel file, generated by the survey tool, which summed the results to determine the percentages of academic faculty selecting extensive, often, some, seldom, and not at all for the influencers.

Academic faculty selected the frequency of contact over the last three years (not at all, seldom, some, often, or extensive) for each channel of communication in the list. The channels of communication were included in the teaching social network when the participants chose seldom, some, often or extensive as the frequency. In other words if they chose not at all the influencers were not included in the teaching social network.

Data Collection

This section describes the overall process of gathering and analyzing the social network analysis data. A pre-pilot study and pilot study were completed last year to validate the feasibility of the study and the survey questions. After the pilot studies were completed revisions were incorporated into the main study data collection.

Social Network Analysis

Surveys were used to gather teaching social network relationship data. The surveys contained a list of potential channels of communication that may...
affect academic faculty when they design and deliver their courses. There was also a free-form question at the end of the survey where academic faculty could list any missing channels of communication. The survey was a short questionnaire that was emailed to the participants. See Appendix A for the complete survey.

The survey question was: “Please indicate to what extent in the last three years each of the listed people/information affected how you teach and what you teach. How you teach refers to: pedagogy/methodology, types of assignments, classroom strategies, or classroom activities. What you teach refers to: content, subject matter, or topics. In the table/matrix below, click on the arrow and select not at all, seldom, some, often, or extensive. Your answers in both columns may differ.” The first column was the list of channels of communication that may have affected academic faculty when they designed and delivered their courses. Academic faculty were asked to indicate the frequency of contact with the channel of communication in how they taught (pedagogy) and what they taught (course content). The list of channels of communication included in the survey were: administration, family member(s), formal evaluations by other faculty members, formal evaluations for other faculty members, former graduate professors and coursework, Las Positas College (LPC) counselors (i.e. DSPS students), LPC department faculty, LPC faculty outside of department, LPC librarians, LPC Teaching and Learning Center [instructional technology group], other librarians (public or academic), personal acquaintances, professional development (on campus workshops; state, regional or nation conferences; or webinars), professional/industrial organizations, scholarly and professional communications (books, journal articles, wikis, blogs), social media (email groups, LISTSERVs, Facebook, Myspace, LinkedIn, Chat), and students. This list was brainstormed with the authors, the pre-pilot study, the pilot study participants and confirmed through the literature review. The survey was designed to elicit responses from the participants to describe their teaching social networks.

Figure 2 Influencers that affected how (pedagogy) collaborators taught. The thicker lines in the graph display a greater impact by the influencers on academic faculty.
Participants

Las Positas College (LPC), a community college in Livermore, California was selected to participate in the main study. The surveys were sent to all full-time faculty members. Ninety-seven full-time faculty were emailed the survey, 78 percent of the faculty responded to the survey.

Categories for the type of respondent were established to determine if academic faculty have similar teaching social networks across the groups. Each academic faculty member was associated with a category. Criteria were established for categorizing academic faculty members into four groups: 1) collaborator, 2) cooperator, 3) potential and 4) non-potential.

1) Collaborators were those individuals who work in conjunction with library faculty when they create assignments, assess students, and devise teaching strategies.

2) Cooperators were those who divide tasks between themselves and library faculty keeping a clear division of responsibilities (Montiel-Overall, 2008). The cooperators typically delegate the information literacy component to library faculty by providing an assignment that requires students to locate, evaluate, and utilize information. The library faculty does not have any input into the creation of the assignment.

3) Potentials were those who did not work with library faculty when developing their curriculum but taught courses with potential for collaboration. The potentials’ courses were determined by reviewing the library and education literature.

4) Non-potentials were those who do not work with library faculty and teach skills-based courses (e.g. graphics design).

Figure 3 Influencers that affected how (pedagogy) potentials taught. The thicker lines in the graph display a greater impact by the influencers on academic faculty.
After initial review of the data, the most distinct differences in the data existed between the collaborators and potentials; therefore, the cooperators and non-potentials will not be discussed in this paper.

**Preliminary Results of Social Network Analysis Survey for Collaborators and Potentials**

This section will discuss the preliminary findings about academic faculty identified as collaborators and potentials that completed the survey. There will be a discussion of academic faculty responses in relation to how the channels of communication affected how they taught (pedagogy). Afterwards, there will be a discussion of academic faculty responses in relation to what they taught (course content). The channels of communication will also be referred to as influencers in this section.
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Figure 4 Influencers that affected what (course content) collaborators taught. The thicker lines in the graph display a greater impact by the influencers on academic faculty.

Analysis of how influencers affect academic faculty in how they taught (pedagogy)

Collaborators and potentials’ teaching social networks were compared in “how” they taught (pedagogy). After initial review of the data, the most distinct differences in the data existed between the collaborators and potentials; therefore, the cooperators and non-potentials will not be discussed in this paper. Collaborators were affected more than potentials by their identified influencers. When asked to what extent in the last three years each of the listed people/information affected how they taught, 30.6 percent of collaborators selected extensive or often. Only 15.2 percent of the potentials made the same selection. In contrast, 84.8 percent of the potentials selected some, seldom, or not at all while 69.4 percent of the collaborators made the same selection. Even though the percentage of academic faculty that extensively used their influencers was low, these
results show the collaborators were more affected by their influencers than the potentials in how they taught.

The social network analysis graphs were created with VisuaLyzer using the data retrieved from the survey for collaborators and potentials. Figure 1 shows the teaching social network for an academic faculty member and is the legend for the colors. The influencers were displayed across the top of the graphs and the survey participants were displayed across the bottom of the graphs. The influencers were classified with a circle shape and yellow color, the collaborators were represented with a star shape and blue color, and the potentials were classified with a diamond shape and green color. The frequency (or relationship/link) colors refer to how often in the last three years the collaborators/potentials were affected. The thicker lines reveal a stronger affect by the influencer on the respondent. Extensive (black) lines have the thickest lines, often (green) and some (blue) have progressively thinner lines, and seldom (pink) has the thinnest line. “Not at all” was not depicted by a color because the influencer was not a part of the teaching social network. Figure 2 shows the results for the people and information (influencers) that affected how collaborators taught their courses. Figure 3 shows the results for the people and information (influencers) that affected how potentials taught their courses.

The graphs show similarities and differences between collaborators and potentials in how academic faculty members taught. Both collaborators and potentials were the most influenced by: students and former graduate professors and coursework. A difference that
emerged suggests that collaborators were most influenced by department faculty and potentials were most influenced by professional development. The least influential to both collaborators and potentials were: social media, other librarians (public or academic), and administration. In addition, collaborators were least influenced by personal acquaintances and potentials were least influenced by LPC library faculty.

Analysis of how influencers affect academic faculty in what they taught (content)

Collaborators and potentials’ teaching social networks were compared in “what” they taught (course content). Collaborators were affected more than potentials by their identified influencers. When asked to what extent in the last three years each of the listed people/information affected what they taught, 18.2 percent of the collaborators selected extensive or often. Only 9.9 percent of the potentials made the same selection. In contrast, 90.1 percent of the potentials selected some, seldom, or not at all while 81.8 percent of the collaborators made the same selection. Even though the percentage of academic faculty that extensively used their influencers was low, these results show the collaborators were more affected by their influencers than the potentials in what they taught.

The social network analysis graphs were created with VisuaLyzer using the data retrieved from the pilot study for collaborators and potentials. Refer to Figure 1 for the legends of the colors. The influencers were displayed across the top of the graphs and the survey participants were displayed across the bottom of the graphs. The influencers were classified with a circle shape and yellow color, collaborators were represented with a star shape and blue color, and the potentials were classified with a diamond shape and green color. The frequency (or relationship/link) colors refer to how often in the last three years the collaborators/potentials were affected 2=seldom, 3=some, 4=often, and 5=extensive. The thicker lines reveal a stronger affect by the influencer on the respondent. Extensive (black) lines have the thickest lines, often (green) and some (blue) have progressively thinner lines, and seldom (pink) has the thinnest line. Figure 4 shows the people and information (influencers) that affected what (course content) for collaborators. Figure 5 shows the people and information (influencers) that affected what (course content) for potentials.

The graphs show similarities and differences between collaborators and potentials in what academic faculty members taught. Both collaborators and potentials were the most influenced by: students, professional development, and former graduate professors and coursework. Potentials were also heavily influenced by scholarly communications. The least influential to both collaborators and potentials were administration and other librarians. A difference that emerged suggests that collaborators were least influenced by social media and personal acquaintances and potentials were least influenced by the Teaching and Learning Center (instructional technology group).

Discussion and Implications

The findings from the survey describing academic faculty’s teaching social network illustrated the majority of academic faculty were not highly influenced in designing and delivering their courses. Both collaborators and potentials were affected more often in how they taught (pedagogy) than what they taught (course content). The Las Positas College library faculty affected the collaborators more than the potentials in both how and what they taught. The preliminary findings suggest that the academic faculty that collaborated with library faculty were more likely to be influenced when they were designing and delivering their courses than the potentials. The channels of communication derived from the literature review (Auman & Lillie, 2008; Benton & Schillo, 2004; Briggs, 2007; Lindsay, et al., 2009) and the pilot study confirmed there was an influence on academic faculty. The strengths of utilizing social network analysis are that a description of academic faculty’s teaching social network is provided and the frequency academic faculty were influenced by the channels of communication is revealed in the analysis. The major weakness of social network analysis was that the question of how the influencers affected academic faculty in their teaching social network was not revealed.

The interviews have provided more clarification of how the channels of communication influenced academic faculty. The preliminary discoveries uncovered by the interviews revealed when library faculty were included in academic faculty’s teaching social network the library faculty provided the information literacy education components of the courses. Additionally the interview data revealed that some of the academic faculty categorized as cooperators (delegating the information literacy components) analyzed how the library faculty taught their portion of the course and incorporated changes from the library faculty into the assignments. When channels of communication were included in teaching social networks new ideas and new ways of presenting material to the students were the primary outcomes of the influence of academic faculty. This data needs further analysis in a future paper.
Conclusion
There is a lot known about collaboration between library and academic faculty from the library faculty perspective, but there is little known about academic faculty members’ teaching social networks. Understanding academic faculty’s teaching social network is important because the academic faculty perspective of collaboration has not been explored extensively in the literature. The preliminary results of my survey describe the teaching social network of academic faculty identified as collaborators and potentials. The preliminary results have shown that the collaborators were more affected by their channels of communications than the potentials. Both collaborators and potentials were more affected in how they taught (pedagogy) than what they taught (course content). This may suggest library faculty should be more focused on collaborating in the pedagogical process. The effect of LPC librarians on academic faculty showed a stronger influence on collaborators than potentials.

The strengths of utilizing social network analysis have been shown to be a) that a description of academic faculty’s teaching social network is provided and b) that the level of frequency academic faculty were influenced by the channels of communication is revealed in the analysis. The major weakness of social network analysis was that the findings were unable to reveal insights into the question of how the influencers affected academic faculty in their teaching social network. In order to address this weakness of social network analysis, 26 interviews of academic faculty were completed to gain a better understanding of how the influencers affected academic faculty. Ways for library faculty to become a more integral part of academic faculty’s teaching social network will be explored for my final dissertation.
Appendix A: Main Study Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW you teach</th>
<th>WHAT you teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations by other faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations for other faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former graduate professors and coursework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC counselors (i.e. DSPS students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC department faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC faculty outside of department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC Teaching and Learning Center (TLC, formerly known as Innovation Center)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other librarians (public or academic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (on campus workshops; state, regional or nation conferences; or webinars)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Industrial organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly and professional communications (books, journal articles, wikis, blogs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media (Email groups, LISTSERVs, Facebook, Myspace, LinkedIn, chat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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