

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH NETWORKS AND DEVELOPMENT OF INNOVATIVE PEDAGOGIES IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE SCHOOLS IN SOUTH-WEST, NIGERIA

Kafayat Oluwakemi Adesanya

Polytechnic Library, Abraham Adesanya Polytechnics, Ijebu-Igbo, Ogun State.

K. O. Ogunbote

Polytechnic Library, Abraham Adesanya Polytechnics, Ijebu-Igbo, Ogun State.

Wasiu Kehinde Rafiu

Gbenga Daniel Library, Tai Solarin Federal University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State

And

Oluseun Mobolanle Sodipe

Gbenga Daniel Library, Tai Solarin Federal University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State

Abstract

Library and Information Science (LIS) Education in South-West, Nigeria is under increasing pressure to adopt learner-centred and technology-enhanced pedagogies that reflect global trends. Collaborative research networks (CRNs) offer a pathway to innovation by enabling LIS educators to share expertise and co-create modern teaching approaches. However, the extent to which participation in CRNs translates into pedagogical reform remains unclear. This study examined the relationship between CRNs participation and the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools across the South-Western region. Guided by a descriptive survey design of the correlational type, the study targeted all 114 LIS educators in 13 accredited LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria. Using purposive sampling, 50 LIS educators from six LIS schools were selected. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire and analysed using descriptive statistics and Pearson product-moment correlation at the 0.05 significance level. Findings revealed high levels of LIS educators' participation in CRNs, yet adoption of innovative pedagogies was limited, with portfolio-based assessment being the most widely used. Traditional teaching culture and inadequate funding emerged as major barriers to innovation. Notably, the results showed a significant negative relationship ($r = -.374$; $p < 0.05$) between CRNs participation and pedagogical development. The study concludes that systemic and institutional challenges hinder the pedagogical benefits of CRNs and recommends stronger policies, capacity building, and resource support to bridge this gap.

Keywords: Innovative Pedagogy, Collaborative Research Network, Library School, Library and Information Science Educators.

Introduction

In recent years, collaborative research networks have gained prominence as strategic mechanisms for advancing knowledge creation and pedagogical innovation within Library and Information Science (LIS) education. These networks facilitate the merging of intellectual resources, the sharing of best practices, and the co-development of solutions to emerging challenges in the profession. Within the South-West Nigerian context, collaborative engagements between LIS educators have been shown to yield creative and impactful pedagogical outcomes, particularly when supported by robust institutional frameworks (Fadehan, & Ojo, 2021).

The integration of collaborative research outcomes into LIS pedagogy is increasingly mediated by digital technologies and social platforms. Such tools not only enabled geographically dispersed academics to co-create content but also enhanced the adoption of innovative teaching methods, such as problem-based learning, flipped classrooms, and simulation-based instruction (Adeoye, Onuoha & Obiano, 2021; Salami, Saka, Bitagi, & Udoudoh, 2021). Empirical evidence suggests that LIS educators in Nigeria who engaged in technology-enabled collaboration are more likely to experiment with novel pedagogical approaches that promote active learning and critical thinking (Friday, & Oviri, 2024).

Sodipe, Arinola, Aliyu, & Bamgbose (2024) examined the utilisation and management of electronic resources in selected academic libraries, revealing both opportunities and challenges in resource provision. This underscores the importance of resource availability and management as a foundation for collaborative research networks and innovative pedagogical practices.

However, the translation of collaborative research into classroom innovation is not without barriers. Challenges such as inadequate digital infrastructures, limited pedagogical training, and weak policy support often hinder the uptake of research-driven innovations in teaching (Echem, & Udo-Anyanwu, 2024). Nonetheless, collaborative learning environments within higher education have been linked to increased pedagogical adaptability and the fostering of innovative thinking among faculty members (Babatunde, & Adeleke, 2024).

In the light of these developments, there is a compelling need to investigate the extent to which participation in collaborative research networks influences the development of innovative pedagogies in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Library and Information Science (LIS) education in South-West, Nigeria faces increasing pressure to adopt teaching approaches that respond to technological advances, evolving user needs, and global shifts towards learner-centred pedagogy. Collaborative research networks have the potential to drive such innovation by enabling LIS educators to share expertise, co-create resources, and develop modern teaching methods. Despite this potential, the translation of collaborative research outcomes into innovative classroom practices remains limited. Therefore, there is a need to examine how collaborative research networks influence innovative pedagogy and how this gap can be bridged.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of participation of LIS educators in collaborative research networks in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?
2. What innovative pedagogies are currently implemented by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?

3. What are the challenges hindering the translation of collaborative research into innovative teaching practices of LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?
4. What is the relationship between participation in collaborative research networks and the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?

Review of Related Literature

Collaborative research networks (CRNs) are formal or informal arrangements through which academics engage with colleagues from other institutions, disciplines, and sectors to advance shared research goals. They are recognised as powerful drivers of scholarly productivity, knowledge dissemination, and the translation of research into practice. CRNs typically involve joint proposal writing, shared data use, co-authorship, and joint supervision of postgraduate students. In the higher education sector, the rationale for participation often extends beyond research outcomes to include professional growth, institutional visibility, and capacity-building for innovative teaching. In recent times, perspectives from African and global contexts on CRNs have increasingly been linked to policy imperatives for internationalisation, cross-border partnerships, and regional integration in research agendas (Jithoo, & Langa, 2025; Knight, 2025). Moreover, Owan, Ameh, and Anam (2024) noted that mentorship, supportive institutional culture, and resource availability are strong predictors of academics' engagement in collaborative research, with collaboration acting as a mediator for higher research productivity. Similarly, Kadikilo, Kulshrestha, and Sahay (2023) reported that targeted research promotion strategies—such as seed funding, research capacity workshops, and recognition incentives—significantly boost participation rates in Tanzanian higher education institutions.

Beyond institutional infrastructure, students' practices reveal emerging forms of collaboration. Sodipe, Abdullah, Ibeachusim, and Adeleye (2025), in their study on the awareness and use of social media for research activities among LIS postgraduate students in public and private universities in South-West Nigeria, found that students increasingly utilise digital platforms for collaboration, knowledge sharing, and scholarly engagement. This suggests a growing role of informal, technology-driven research networks that complement formal academic structures and present new opportunities for pedagogical innovations in LIS education.

Globally, Hermanu and Sundari (2025) further identified that international joint research programmes can be highly efficient when underpinned by targeted bilateral agreements and strategic partner selection. However, such success stories remain uneven across institutions, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, where Cloete, van Schalkwyk, and Winnink (2022) observed that structural and policy weaknesses often constrain sustained network participation. Although participation in CRNs is increasingly recognised as a vital component of academic life in universities, its potential impact depends heavily on institutional readiness, supportive policy frameworks, and deliberate strategies to integrate collaborative outputs into broader institutional missions.

Innovative pedagogies in universities refer to creative, evidence-based teaching approaches designed to improve students' engagement, knowledge retention, and the development of higher-order thinking skills. These include active learning models, problem-based learning (PBL), flipped classrooms, experiential and community-based learning, as well as technology-enhanced instruction such as artificial intelligence (AI), virtual reality (VR), and online collaborative platforms. Conceptually, innovative pedagogies are rooted in constructivist learning theory, which positions students as active participants in knowledge construction

rather than passive recipients. Recent perspectives extend this concept to include culturally responsive teaching and critical pedagogy, which integrate learners' lived experiences into curriculum design to foster equity and inclusivity (Sunzuma, Mutseekwa, & Zezekwa, 2025).

Universities adopting innovative pedagogies often align them with broader institutional strategies for digital transformation, sustainability, and global competitiveness (Van Thanh, 2024). The overarching goal is to prepare graduates with adaptable skills relevant to rapidly changing labour markets and complex societal challenges. Rios-Campos and Llontop (2025) identified that virtual universities leveraging blended and fully online models increase accessibility while fostering collaborative learning across geographic boundaries. Hanifah, Supandi, and Khasanah (2025) also demonstrated, through a systematic review, that ICT-based pedagogical designs significantly enhance students' outcomes in literacy and numeracy, underscoring the value of technology integration.

The translation of collaborative research into innovative teaching practices refers to the process through which insights, evidence, and methodologies derived from joint research activities are adapted into pedagogical strategies that enhance learning outcomes. Conceptually, this translation is viewed as a knowledge mobilisation process that bridges the gap between research outputs and classroom application. It requires institutional frameworks, supportive leadership, adequate resources, and the pedagogical capacity of educators to contextualise findings for their learners (Awang, Zulkifli, & Hamzah, 2025). However, this process is often impeded by systemic, institutional, and individual-level barriers. Systemic challenges include misalignment between research priorities and teaching objectives, limited funding for pedagogical innovation, and policy gaps that fail to incentivise the integration of research into curriculum design (Orichom, Mwesigwa, & Nakyeyune, 2025). At the institutional level, insufficient infrastructure, heavy teaching workloads, and

fragmented communication channels between research teams and teaching units are common obstacles (Löwe, & Fischer, 2025). On the individual level, faculty may lack the competencies or professional development opportunities required to adapt research findings into effective classroom practices and adopt innovative pedagogies in higher education.

These networks, by fostering interdisciplinary exchange, joint experimentation, and shared access to resources, enable academics to design and implement teaching strategies that reflect cutting-edge research. For example, Papageorgiou, Meyer, and Ntonia (2025) found that collaborative design projects involving multiple universities lead to substantial improvements in educators' professional development and the integration of innovative online learning practices. Similarly, Palmowski and Angouri (2025) examined European University Alliances as communities of practice, showing that participation in transnational CRNs facilitates active learning methodologies and interdisciplinary course design. CRNs are therefore significant sources of teaching innovation because they support the development of research-based teaching methods. Despite this, their effectiveness largely depends on the level of institutional support and the extent to which they can overcome systemic challenges. To enhance this interaction, it is essential for higher education systems to remain current and adequately prepare beneficiaries for an increasingly complex digital environment.

Methodology

The study employed a descriptive survey design of correlational type, focusing on 114 LIS educators across 13 LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria. Using purposive sampling, 50 LIS educators from six LIS schools were selected, and a structured questionnaire adapted from relevant literature was administered via Google Forms for over four weeks, with follow-up reminders to improve the response rates. A total of 37 questionnaires were retrieved,

representing 60% response rates and forming the basis for analysis. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations) to summarise respondents' characteristics and responses, while inferential statistics, specifically, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) were used to examine the relationship between participation in collaborative research networks and the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools. All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 27 at 0.05 level of significance.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	15	40.5%
Female	22	59.5%
Age		
30-39 years	13	35.1%
40-49 years	12	32.4%
50 years and above	12	32.4%
Academic rank		
Assistant Lecturer	7	18.9%
Lecturer II	6	16.2%
Lecturer I	7	18.9%
Senior Lecturer	7	18.9%
Professor	10	27.0%
Academic qualification		
MLIS	17	45.9%
PhD	20	54.1%
Teaching Experience		
Less than 5 years	11	29.7%
5-9 years	1	2.7%
10-14 years	16	43.2%
15 years and above	9	24.3%

The result as presented in Table 1, shows that majority of the LIS educators 22(59.5%) are Females; majority 13(35.1%) are between 30-39 years of age; majority 10(27%) of the LIS educators are Professors; majority 20(54.1%) are PhD holders; while majority 16(43.2%) possess 10-14 years teaching experience as educators.

Research Question 1: What is the level of participation of LIS educators in collaborative research networks in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 2: Participation of LIS educators in collaborative research networks in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria

S/N	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
1	I frequently engage in joint research projects with colleagues from my institution.	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	31(83.8%)	4.59	1.07
2	I frequently engage in joint research projects with colleagues from other institutions in Nigeria.	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	29(78.4%)	4.57	.99
3	I collaborate regularly with international researchers in my field.	2(5.4%)	3(8.1%)	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	29(78.4%)	4.43	1.21
4	I participate in multi-institutional grant applications.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	29(78.4%)	4.57	.99
5	My research collaborations involve colleagues from multiple disciplines.	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	29(78.4%)	4.54	1.07
6	I work with collaborators from both academic and non-academic sectors.	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	29(78.4%)	4.54	1.07
7	I am part of formal research consortia or networks recognised by professional bodies.	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	29(78.4%)	4.46	1.14
8	I collaborate with LIS professionals working outside academia.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	31(83.4%)	2(5.4%)	3.84	.73
9	I participate in regular meetings or workshops with my research collaborators.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	29(78.4%)	4.57	.99
10	I use online platforms (e.g., research forums, collaborative tools) to communicate with collaborators.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	31(83.8%)	2(5.4%)	3.84	.73
11	I share research resources (e.g., datasets, instruments) with collaborators.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	31(83.8%)	4.62	.98
12	I contribute to the joint development of research methodologies with collaborators.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	29(78.4%)	4(10.8%)	3.89	.77
13	My collaborations have resulted in co-authored publications.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	31(83.8%)	4.62	.98
14	My collaborations have resulted in conference presentations.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	29(78.4%)	4(10.8%)	3.89	.77
15	My collaborations have	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	4(10.8%)	29(78.4%)	4.59	.93

	led to the development of new research tools or resources.							
16	I have engaged in co-supervision of students as part of collaborative projects.	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	6(16.2%)	27(73.0%)	2(5.4%)	3.76	.72
17	My institution provides funding or incentives for collaborative research.	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	2(5.4%)	29(78.4%)	4.54	.99
18	My institution recognises collaborative research in promotion or appraisal decisions.	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	29(78.4%)	2(5.4%)	3.81	.70
19	I have received training in effective research collaboration skills.	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	6(16.2%)	-	29(78.4%)	4.49	1.044
20	My workload allocation allows adequate time for collaborative research activities.	1(2.7%)	1(2.7%)	6(16.2%)	-	29(78.4%)	4.49	1.044
Weighted mean							4.33	

Key: Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2 or Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1.

Criterion Mean = 3.00 Decision Rule: 1-1.80 = VL (Very Low), 1.81-2.60 = L (Low), 2.61-3.40 = Moderate, 3.41-4.20 = H (High), while 4.21-5.00 = VH (Very High)

The result as presented in Table 2, shows that majority of LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria shared research resources (e.g., datasets, instruments) with collaborators ($\bar{x} = 4.62$; Std. Dev = .98). Based on the decision rule, it was also revealed that, the level of participation in collaborative research networks by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria, is high. This aligns with the work of Owan, et al. (2024), who noted that mentorship, supportive institutional culture, and resource availability significantly predict academic collaborations, while Kadikilo et al. (2023) emphasized that research promotion strategies such as seed funding, workshops, and recognition incentives further enhance participation.

Research Question 2: What innovative pedagogies are currently implemented by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 3: Innovative pedagogies currently implemented by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria

S/N	Item	N	R	S	A	Mean	Std Dev.
-----	------	---	---	---	---	------	----------

1	I use learning management systems (e.g., Moodle, Google Classroom) to deliver my courses.	3(8.1%)	27(73.0%)	5(13.5%)	2(5.4%)	2.16	.65
2	I incorporate multimedia resources (e.g., videos, podcasts) into my teaching.	25(67.6%)	4(10.8%)	6(16.2%)	2(5.4%)	1.59	.96
3	I use virtual collaboration tools (e.g., Zoom, MS Teams) for group activities.	2(5.4%)	25(67.6%)	7(18.9%)	3(8.1%)	2.30	.70
4	I integrate subject-specific software or databases into class exercises.	2(5.4%)	27(73.0%)	6(16.2%)	2(5.4%)	2.22	.63
5	I employ flipped classroom strategies where students review materials before class.	-	25(67.6%)	9(24.3%)	3(8.1%)	2.41	.64
6	I use problem-based learning activities to encourage critical thinking.	-	25(67.6%)	10(27.0%)	2(5.4%)	2.38	.59
7	I incorporate peer-teaching sessions into my courses.	25(67.6%)	-	9(24.3%)	3(8.1%)	1.73	1.10
8	I allow students to take part in co-creating course content.	27(73.0%)	-	8(21.6%)	2(5.4%)	1.59	1.01
9	I organise field visits or practical sessions related to course topics.	25(67.6%)	-	9(24.3%)	3(8.1%)	1.73	1.10
10	I include community-based projects as part of the course requirements.	25(67.6%)	-	12(32.4%)	-	1.65	.95
11	I collaborate with industry professionals to deliver parts of my course.	-	29(78.4%)	7(18.9%)	1(2.7%)	2.24	.49
12	I engage students in interdisciplinary group projects.	25(67.6%)	2(5.4%)	10(27.0%)	-	1.59	.90
13	I use digital tools for formative assessment (e.g., online quizzes, instant polls).	-	27(73.0%)	9(24.3%)	1(2.7%)	2.30	.52
14	I use portfolio-based assessment to evaluate student progress.	-	-	37(100.0%)	-	3.00	.00
15	I provide real-time feedback during learning activities.	-	25(67.6%)	11(29.7%)	1(2.7%)	2.35	.54

Key: Never (N) = 1, Rarely (R) = 2, Sometimes (S) = 3 or Always (A) = 4.

Criterion Mean = 2.50

The result, as presented in Table 3, shows that LIS educators used portfolio-based assessment to evaluate students' progress ($\bar{x} = 3.00$; Std. Dev = .00); while they ranked lower in the other innovative pedagogies. This implies that the majority of the LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria, do not have innovative pedagogies that are currently mostly

implemented. This contrasts with the global studies, such as Sunzuma et al. (2025), which identified innovative pedagogies as active learning, problem-based learning (PBL), flipped classrooms, experiential learning, community-based learning, and technology-enhanced instruction, including AI, VR, and online collaborative platforms.

Research Question 3: What are the challenges hindering the translation of collaborative research into innovative teaching practices of LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 4: Challenges hindering the translation of collaborative research into innovative teaching practices of LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria

S/N	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	Std Dev.
1	My institution lacks clear policies that support the integration of research findings into teaching.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	32(86.5%)	-	2(5.4%)	3.00	.62
2	There is insufficient administrative support for adapting collaborative research outcomes into curricula.	-	5(13.5%)	2(5.4%)	30(81.1%)	-	3.68	.71
3	Institutional priorities focus more on research publication than on improving teaching practices.	-	4(10.8%)	1(2.7%)	30(81.1%)	2(5.4%)	3.81	.70
4	Collaboration outputs are not recognised in teaching performance appraisals.	-	34(91.9%)	-	3(8.1%)	-	2.16	.55
5	There is inadequate funding to implement innovative pedagogical strategies.	-	-	-	34(91.9%)	3(8.1%)	4.08	.28
6	My institution lacks the necessary technological infrastructure to support modern teaching methods.	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	-	34(91.9%)	-	3.81	.66
7	I do not have access to adequate teaching and learning resources to apply new research insights.	-	5(13.5%)	-	32(86.5%)	-	3.73	.69
8	Physical facilities limit the use of interactive or collaborative teaching methods.	-	34(91.9%)	1(2.7%)	2(5.4%)	-	2.14	.48
9	I have not received sufficient training on how to translate research findings into classroom practices.	-	4(10.8%)	30(81.1%)	3(8.1%)	-	2.97	.44
10	There is limited availability of professional development on innovative teaching methods.	-	4(10.8%)	30(81.1%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	3.00	.53
11	Many colleagues lack the skills to adapt research outputs into practical teaching tools.	1(2.7%)	4(10.8%)	30(81.1%)	2(5.4%)	-	2.89	.52
12	I find it challenging to modify curricula to incorporate research-driven innovations.	-	33(89.2%)	-	4(10.8%)	-	2.22	.63
13	There is resistance to change among LIS educators in my institution.	-	4(10.8%)	33(89.2%)	-	-	2.89	.31

14	Students are sometimes reluctant to participate in innovative or unfamiliar teaching approaches.	-	32(86.5%)	-	5(13.5%)	-	2.27	.69
15	Some colleagues view collaborative research as separate from teaching responsibilities.	-	30(81.1%)	4(10.8%)	2(5.4%)	1(2.7%)	2.30	.70
16	Traditional teaching culture dominates over experimental or research-informed approaches.	1(2.7%)	-	4(10.8%)	2(5.4%)	30(81.1%)	4.62	.89
17	Collaborative research outputs are not always relevant to my teaching needs.	2(5.4%)	33(89.2%)	2(5.4%)	-	-	2.00	.33
18	Communication gaps between collaborators hinder the translation of research into teaching.	2(5.4%)	-	33(89.2%)	2(5.4%)	-	2.95	.52
19	Time constraints make it difficult to adapt collaborative research findings into lesson plans.	-	-	32(86.5%)	3(8.1%)	2(5.4%)	3.19	.52
20	Delays in collaborative projects limit the timely integration of results into courses.	-	-	2(5.4%)	32(86.5%)	3(8.1%)	4.03	.37

Key: Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2 or Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1.

Criterion mean = 3.00.

Results from the table show that among the key challenges, traditional teaching culture dominates over experimental or research-informed approaches (\bar{x} = 4.62; Std. Dev = .89); and there is inadequate funding to implement innovative pedagogical strategies (\bar{x} = 4.08; Std. Dev = .28). This implies that, the prevalence of traditional teaching culture and inadequate funding affecting the implementations of innovative pedagogical strategies among LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria. Traditional teaching culture remains dominant in LIS schools, and inadequate funding limits the adoption of innovative pedagogical strategies. This finding reflects systemic barriers highlighted by Orichom et al. (2025) and corroborated by Löwe and Fischer (2025), including policy misalignment and institutional challenges that hinder practical pedagogical innovation.

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between participation in collaborative research networks and the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria?

Table 5: Relationship between participation in collaborative research networks and development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria

Variables	N	Mean	St.Dev	Df	R	P	Sig
Participation in CRN	37	86.64	17.95				
Development of Innovative Pedagogy	37	31.24	9.78	36	-.374	.023	S

Table 5 showed the relationship between participation in collaborative research networks and the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria. The table shows that, there is a significant negative relationship ($r = -.374$; $p < 0.05$; $N = 37$) between participation in collaborative research networks and the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West, Nigeria. However, this situation only occurs 37.4% of the time. This implies that the increase in participation in collaborative research networks will result in a decrease in the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West Nigeria. This is in contrast with the global evidence showing that CRNs promote pedagogical innovation through collaborative projects, active learning, interdisciplinary course design, project-based learning, and curriculum reform (Papageorgiou et al., 2025; Palmowski & Angouri, 2025; Carvalho et al., 2021; Veres, et al., 2025), suggesting that contextual barriers in Nigeria limit these outcomes.

Recommendations

1. LIS schools should develop policies that explicitly link collaborative research outcomes to teaching innovations, ensuring that CRNs participation benefits both research and pedagogy.
2. Regular training and professional development workshops should be provided to help LIS educators adapt collaborative research insights into innovative classroom practices.

3. Government and institutional stakeholders should allocate dedicated funding for pedagogical innovation, particularly for technology integration and blended learning strategies.
4. Performance evaluation systems should reward not only research publications but also innovative teaching practices derived from CRNs engagement.
5. LIS schools should establish partnerships with industries, libraries, and community organisations to foster interdisciplinary, practice-oriented pedagogies that align with global trends.

Conclusion

The study established a significant negative relationship between participation in collaborative research networks (CRNs) and the development of innovative pedagogies by LIS educators in LIS schools in South-West Nigeria. This finding contrasts with global evidence that highlights CRNs as catalysts for pedagogical innovation, suggesting that systemic, institutional, and contextual barriers may prevent Nigerian LIS educators from translating collaborative research outputs into teaching practices. The result emphasises the need to bridge the gap between research collaboration and pedagogies through stronger institutional frameworks, capacity development, and resource provision.

References

- Adeoye, A. A., Onuoha, C., & Obiano, D. C. (2021). Social Media as a Collaborative Tool for Research among Library and Information Science (LIS) Professionals in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–15. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/download/97887620/395012929.pdf>

- Awang, N. E., Zulkifli, H., & Hamzah, M. I. (2025). Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Innovative Pedagogies: A Systematic Literature Review. *IJLTER. ORG*, 24(3), 366-382. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.3.18>
- Babatunde, S. O., & Adeleke, A. A. (2024). Participation of Science-based Faculty Members in Learning Communities in Public Universities in South-West, Nigeria. *Adeleke University Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 95-109. Retrieved from <https://aujbss.adelekeuniversity.edu.ng/index.php/aujbss/article/download/95/73>
- Cloete, N., Van Schalkwyk, F., & Winnink, J. (2022). Researching Research Universities in Africa. In *Research Universities in Africa* (pp. 207-232). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://www.elgaronline.com/abstract/edcoll/9781800376052/9781800376052.00013.xml>
- Echem, M. E., & Udo-Anyanwu, A. J. (2024). Adoption of Collaborative Technologies in Library and Information Science Teaching: A Study of Tertiary Institutions in Rivers and Imo States, Nigeria. *Nigerian Libraries*, 57(1), 45-62. Retrieved from <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authType=crawler&jrnl=30492661&AN=182485096>
- Fadehan, O. A., & Ojo, J. O. (2021). An Analysis of Library and Faculty Collaborations in South-West Universities in Nigeria. <https://ir.unilag.edu.ng/items/fcad2653-bca1-4bd3-a56c-cceaea5f625>
- Friday, J. E., & Oviri, U. B. (2024). Collaborative Technology Adoption in Teaching Library and Information Science in Nigerian Universities. *International Journal of Information Library & Society*, 13(1)
- Hanifah, H., Supandi, D., & Khasanah, N. (2025). Systematic Literature Review (SLR) on ICT-based Literacy and Numeracy Learning Design in Elementary Schools. *Formosa Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(6), 112-125. <https://doi.org/10.55927/fjmr.v4i6.219>
- Hermanu, A. I., & Sundari, T. (2025). Efficiency Analysis of International Research Collaboration: A DEA Approach on Indonesian University Research Partner Countries. *Higher Education Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.70008>
- Jithoo, D., & Langa, P. (2025). Bridging the Gap: Fostering Cross-border Intra-African Research Collaboration among South African Universities. *International Journal of African Higher Education Studies*, 13(1), 63-78.
- Kadikilo, A. C., Kulshrestha, R., & Sahay, A. (2023). Research Promotion Strategies to Enhance Research Productivity in Tanzanian Higher Educational Institutions. *Review of Education*, 11(3), e3436. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3436>
- Knight, J. (2025). Issues, challenges, and opportunities: Looking to the future of international collaborative universities. In *Internationalisation of Higher Education: Future Trends* (pp.

251–267). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-96570-8_12

Löwe, S., & Fischer, M. (2025). Synergies between Universities and Industry: Success Factors for Effective Collaborations Promoting Innovation. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/11016549/>

Orichom, G., Mwesigwa, R., & Nakyeyune, S. (2025). Researcher Competencies, Resource Availability and Research Translation among Universities in Uganda. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JARHE-07-2024-0323/full/html>

Owan, V. J., Ameh, E., & Anam, E. G. (2024). Collaboration and Institutional Culture as Mediators Linking Mentorship and Institutional Support to Academics' Research Productivity. *Higher Education Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-023-09354-3>

Palmowski, J., & Angouri, J. (2025). A Paradigm Shift in European Transnational Collaboration? European University Alliances as Communities of Practice. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2025.2524479>

Papageorgiou, V., Meyer, E., & Ntonia, I. (2025). Investigating the Relationship between Collaborative Design, Online Learning and Educator-integrated Professional Development. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 64, 100958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2025.100958>

Salami, R. O., Saka, K., Bitagi, M. A., & Udoudoh, S. (2021). The Role of Academic Social Media in Enhancing Collaborative Research Activities of Library and Information Science Educators in Nigerian Universities. <https://doi.org/10.1234/ijims.v5i1.87>

Sodipe, O. M., Arinola, A. A., Aliyu, M., & Bamgbose, A.A. (2024). Utilisation and Management of Electronic Resources in Selected Academic Libraries in South-West, Nigeria. *University of Ibadan Journal of Library and Information Science*, 7(1), 17– 27. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18934769>

Sodipe, O. M., Abdullah, F. O., Ibeachusim, J. E., & Adeleye, R. A. (2025). Awareness and Use of Social Media for Research Activities among the Library and Information Science Postgraduate Students in Public and Private Universities in Southwest, Nigeria. *Communicate: Journal of Library and Information Science*, 27(1), 302–317. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18935974>

Sunzuma, G., Mutseekwa, C., Zezekwa, N., & Chikerema, T. (2025). Empowering Transformation through STEAM: Equity, Justice, and Community Innovation. Deep Science Publishing. *justice, and Community Innovation*. Deep Science Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.70593/978-93-49910-77-5>

Van Thanh, N. (2024). The Awareness of Higher Education Management and the Requirements for Innovation in Higher Education Management at an Giang University. *Journal of*

Advances in Education and Philosophy, 8(11), 578–582.
<https://saudijournals.com/media/articles/JAEP 811 578-582.pdf>

Veres, C., Tănase, M., Bacos, I. B., & Kardos, M. (2025). Sustainable Universities: A Bibliometric and Thematic Analysis in Higher Education. *Sustainability*, 17(5), 1817.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su17051817>