DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, Vol. 42, No. 6, November 2022, pp. 414-419, DOI : 10.14429/djlit.42.6.18467

Research Online Visibility of LIS Faculties at Central Universities in North India: An Analysis of Google Scholar

Pragya Lohia[#,*] and Hari Prakash[$]

[#]*Department of Library and Information Science, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda – 151 401, India*
[$]*Department of Library and Information Science, University of Delhi, Delhi - 110 007, India*
[*]*E-mail: prgylh99@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The study examines the Google Scholar profile of LIS faculties employed in central universities of North India to determine their research online visibility. Data was obtained by doing manual searches on Google scholar on 4 July 2022 with the appropriate name of the faculties and their affiliation. The study found that 74 % of the faculty have a Google Scholar profile. Findings show that Prof. Margam Madhusudhan (DU) is leading among the faculties with a citation count of 1715, the highest number of publications, 162, and the highest i10 index of 31. Further, Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee (BHU) and Prof. Margam Madhusudhan (DU) have the highest-ranked h-index, with 18 each leading the list. The authors advocate that a GS profile can be used to assess the research productivity of the faculty and that the authors' work is more accessible if they create a Google Scholar profile for personal and institutional ranking purposes. The study also recommends displaying thrust areas for faculty members to boost the visibility of their areas of interest, which can be used for collaboration by other faculties or researchers with similar interests in India and overseas.

Keywords: Research online visibility; Google scholar profile; Library and Information Science faculty; Central Universities, North India

1. INTRODUCTION

"The online representation of a researcher and the linked online research is crucial to enhance the online visibility of the researcher"[1]. The researcher's online visibility improves the accessibility of the researcher's scientific output. Online research visibility is attained by being open to the whole research cycle, fostering, sharing, and disseminating research publications. On this account, the available academic online profiling platform has opened new opportunities for researchers to reach out to the broader population. It enables researchers to provide visibility to their research output and works as a tool for increasing researcher discoverability. The study's premise is based on the idea that a researcher's research accessibility can be improved through online visibility.

Google Scholar (GS), launched in 2004, is a freely accessible scholarly search engine. It allows users to search for the full text or metadata of articles, theses, books, conference proceedings, reports, etc[2]. In 2012, Google Scholar (GS) opened the door for a researcher to utilise its service of making an author profile and curating one's publications. For this paper, the focus has been explicitly given to the profiling feature of GS. "Opening an individual account and filling it with scholarly content increases the visibility of research output and boosts its impact"[3]. Google Scholar profile keeps tracking and giving information about a researcher's citation count, h index, and i10 index. This paper investigates the online research visibility of Library and Information Science faculties working in the Central Universities of North India and highlights citation metrics available on their Google Scholar profile.

Received : 25 August 2022, Revised : 13 December 2022
Accepted : 16 December 2022, Online published : 02 January 2023

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Adriaanse & Rensleigh[1] investigated the "e-visibility of environmental science researchers at the University of South Africa, with a particular emphasis on online presence, researcher discoverability, and accessibility of SES researchers' research output. Findings of the study reveal that online research presence indicates a preference for using free search engines versus fee-based traditional resources".

Maurya, *et al*.[4] examined the research performance of LIS faculty members and showed "variations in publications and citations with growth in publications and fluctuations in citations". A researcher has also discovered the "top productive authors, top-cited authors, and top-cited journal articles".

Lateef, *et al*.[5] investigated African Scholars' use of Google Scholar Citation (GSC) "to determine e-visibility and productivity". Authors revealed that "GSC is a veritable tool to assess visibility and productivity of African scholars and their institutions."

Gasparyan, *et al*.[3] described emerging and widespread profiling platforms and highlighted "their tools for sharing

scholarly articles, accrediting individuals, and facilitating networks". This study has discovered that "Global bibliographic databases and search platforms, such as Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed, and Google Scholar, are widely used for profiling authors with indexed publications" and outlined various advantages and few limitations of currently available profiling formats.

Francke[6] explored "how neoliberal ideals increasingly govern academic researchers' activities, such as the expectation that they are visible online and actively promote their work and study, which adds to our understanding of how researchers utilize and respond to digital tools for online visibility."

Mikki, *et al*.[7] differentiated profiles from five different profiling sites, and out of which one is a Google Scholar citation. Researchers investigated the correlation between bibliometric measures, such as publications and citations, and user activities, such as downloads and followers. R. Rekha & A. Rupesh K.[8] investigated the online scholarly visibility of LIS teachers of India on Google Scholar and Mendeley and find out a correlation between the citation counts and reader counts.

Kjellberg & Haider[9] investigated how researchers approach their "online presentations and how they develop, manage, access, and more broadly view it". Their study demonstrates that traditional scholarly communication documents establish credibility and reputation in the new context. In this regard, the significance of formal publications is bolstered rather than undermined by the advent of social networking websites. Bhattacharyya[10] also stated that not using social platforms like ResearchGate, Academia.edu, and others can be a reason for insufficient research visibility.

Ali & Richardson[11] examined the profiles of Pakistani LIS scholars who are members of the Google Scholars Citations profiling system and revealed that solid correlations existed between Google Scholar Citations metrics (publications, citations, h-index, and i10-index). The study concluded that despite the platform's low adoption, it is a promising resource for addressing some of the cohort's challenges, such as publishing in languages and/or journals not indexed by standard citation databases.

Kim & Grofman[12] reveals that individuals with high citation counts are more likely to have profiles than those with low citation counts. They concluded their study by emphasising the expanding use of "Google Scholar and profile" and the growing significance of an online presence in the academy.

Khan & Soomro[13] concentrated "on the visibility of Pakistani university scholars on Google Scholar (GS) and analysed scholars' research performance over the last five years, from 2016 to 2020. The authors concluded by discussing the ethical issue of misrepresenting information on one's public profile and the implications for a legitimate scholar's ranking".

The above review of the literature found that very meagre studies exist on online research visibility related to Library and Information Science domain. There has yet to be a study carried out on LIS faculty working in Central Universities of North India. Further, only a few studies only paid attention to the Google scholar academic faculty profiling. They should have provided an in-detailed analysis of citations and ranking of the faculty members, such as h-index, i10 index, total publication counts, total citation counts, and ranking of LIS faculty members. Hence, this study aims to fill the gap identified above.

3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study's main objective is to find out the online research visibility of the LIS faculty of Central Universities in North India on Google Scholar and to convey the importance of online presence to LIS faculties. The study uses a Google Scholar profile to assess faculty research productivity for individual and institutional ranking purposes and to make the faculty's work more accessible. The study also suggests presenting thrust areas for faculty members to increase the visibility of their areas of interest for collaboration with other faculties or academics in India and abroad with similar interests. Finally, it looks forward to providing enough insight for individual faculty to improve their Google Scholar profiles.

4. METHODOLOGY

- To identify the presence of LIS faculties working in Central Universities of North India on Google Scholar;
- To find out total publications, citation counts, h-index, and i10 index on Google scholar profile of the LIS faculties under study;
- To rank the LIS faculties based on Google scholar metrics;
- To assess the correlation between publication count and citation metrics.

The study adopted the *"Observation method*" with the help of the Google Scholar database. The online profile data of LIS faculties have been collected manually from the respective faculty's profile page on Google Scholar and the website of their respective university. The parameters used for the same such as appropriate name and affiliation. Only 31 (thirty-one) faculty members working in the Department of Library and Information Science of studied universities during the observation period were included (Table 1). The geographical area covered in this study is North India. The research data was retrieved on 04th July 2022, and data analysis took place from 10 – 25 July 2022. The responses received from respondents' online profiles were analysed with the help of statistical techniques, such as descriptive statistics using MS-Excel 2019 and IBM SPSS statistics (version 26).

Further, Pearson correlation, a specialized statistical technique, was used to find the correlation among the metrics with standard formulae.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Data is analysed in accordance with the objective of the study and presented in tables with appropriate explanations.

5.1 Research Visibility on Google Scholar

Understanding Google Scholar's (GS) quality and dependability in scope and content is crucial as it continues to

Table 1. LIS faculty members' profiles on Google Scholar

University	Total faculty members	Visibility on Google Scholar
Aligarh Muslim University (AMU)	07	07
Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (BBAU)	07	06
Banaras Hindu University (BHU)	08	04
Central University of Haryana (CUH)	03	02
Central University of Punjab (CUP)	04	04
Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU)	06	03
University of Delhi (DU)	07	05
Total	42	31

gain popularity as a free scholarly literature retrieval source. Table 1 shows that the listed universities have a total of 42 LIS faculty members, out of which 31 (i.e.,74 %) are visible on Google Scholar, which means they have Google Scholar Profile. "The result of this section is inconsistent with those of another recent research by Ali and Richardson[11]. They discovered only 57.69 % of the samples had a Google Scholar profile". Except for IGNOU and BHU, more than 50 % of all the listed central universities' LIS faculty members have their profiles on Google Scholar. All AMU and CUP faculty members have profiles on Google Scholar.

5.2 Google Scholar Metrics Visible on the GS Profile

"Google Scholar metrics provide an easy way for authors to quickly gauge the visibility and influence of recent articles in scholarly publications"[14]. Appendix I highlights metrics data (i.e., total publication, total citation, h-index & i10 index) and summoned the faculties who have mentioned email for verification (i.e., institutional ID) and thrust area on their GS profile. Faculties having (✓) corresponding to their names showcase that they have mentioned institutional ID and specified thrust areas to their GS profile.

Appendix I reveals that 19.4 % (6) respondents still need to verify their official emails, and an equal number have not mentioned their thrust areas, which are vital for faculty members for online research visibility. Interestingly, all remaining metrics exist on the studied respondent's profile pages.

5.3 Top 10 LIS Faculties Based on the Highest Citation Count

Based on the data collected, further analysis has been done, such as citation count, publication count, h-index and i10 index.

"The citation count is calculated by how many times a particular publication is cited by other articles"[15]. Google Scholar has a feature of automatically tracking citation counts. There is a lot of difference in GS metrics between studied faculty members, and ten ranked studied faculty members are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 shows that the LIS faculties of the Central University of North India are arranged as per their citation count in descending order. Prof. Margam Madhusudhan (DU) is leading among the faculties with a citation count of 1715, followed by Prof. Nishat Fatima (AMU) with 902, Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee (BHU) with 819 and are the top three LIS faculty members based on highest citation count.

Table 2. Top 10 LIS faculties based on the highest citation count

Rank	Name	University	Citation count
1	Prof. Margam Madhusudhan	DU	1715
2	Prof. Nishat Fatima	AMU	902
3	Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee	BHU	819
4	Prof. Kunwar Pal Singh	DU	768
5	Dr. Mohammad Nazim	AMU	688
6	Prof. Dinesh Kumar Gupta	CUH	627
7	Prof. Naushad Ali P.M	AMU	582
8	Prof. Rakesh Kumar Bhatt	DU	371
9	Dr. Sharad Kumar Sonker	BBAU	309
10	Dr. Jaideep Sharma	IGNOU	304

Therefore, according to the Google Scholar Profile, Table 2 highlights the top 10 highly cited LIS faculties of different Central Universities in North India.

5.4 Top 10 LIS Faculties Based on the Highest Publication Count

The publication count is the total publication of the individual researcher. Table 3 lists the top 10 LIS faculties of the central university of North India in descending order of their publication count. Table 3 reveals that Prof. Margam Madhusudhan (DU) has the highest number of publications, with a publication count of 162 and ranked 1, followed by Prof. K P Singh (DU) with 102, Prof. Nishat Fatima (AMU) with 96. Interestingly, Prof. Margam Madhusudhan and Prof. K P Singh of the University of Delhi (DU) are the only faculties with a

Table 3. Top 10 LIS faculties based on the highest publication count

Rank	Name	University	Publication count
1	Prof. Margam. Madhusudhan	DU	162
2	Prof. Kunwar Pal Singh	DU	102
3	Prof. Nishat Fatima	AMU	96
4	Dr. Sharad Kumar Sonker	BBAU	81
5	Prof. Uma Kanjilal	IGNOU	72
6	Prof. Naushad Ali P.M	AMU	66
7	Prof. M. Masoom Raza	AMU	60
7	Dr. Kunwar Singh	BHU	60
8	Dr. Mohammad Nazim	AMU	58
9	Prof. Shilpi Verma	BBAU	57
10	Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee	BHU	56

publication count of more than 100.

5.5 Top 5 LIS Faculties Based on their h-Index

The "h index gives an estimate of the importance, significance, and broad impact of a scientist's cumulative research contributions"[16]. Table 4 highlights the top 5 LIS faculties in the decreasing order of their h-index.

Table 4. Top 5 LIS faculties based on their h-index

Rank	Name	University	h-index
1	Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee	BHU	18
1	Prof. Margam. Madhusudhan	DU	18
2	Dr. Mohammad Nazim	AMU	16
2	Prof. Kunwar Pal Singh	DU	16
3	Prof. Dinesh Kumar Gupta	CUH	15
4	Prof. Nishat Fatima	AMU	14
5	Prof. Naushad Ali P.M	AMU	11
5	Prof. Rakesh Kumar Bhatt	DU	11

Table 4 shows that Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee (BHU) and Prof. Margam Madhusudhan (DU) ranked 1 with the highest h-index of 18 among other LIS faculties, followed by Prof. K.P. Singh (DU) and Dr. Mohammad Nazim (AMU) with 16 h-index and ranked 2 and so on. Hirsch & Buela-Casal[17] states that the "h-index is an indicator of the impact of a researcher on the development of his or her scientific field". So, it is concluded that these top 5 LIS faculties contribute more than other LIS faculties to their field.

5.6 Top 5 LIS Faculties Based on their i10 Index

The "i10-index is used only in Google Scholar, which is the number of publications with at least 10 citations, and Google introduces it in 2011"[18]. Table 5 presents the highest i10 index of LIS faculties.

Table 5. Top 5 LIS faculties based on their i10 index

Rank	Name	University	i10 index
1	Prof. Margam. Madhusudhan	DU	31
2	Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee	BHU	26
3	Prof. Nishat Fatima	AMU	21
4	Dr. Mohammad Nazim	AMU	20
4	Prof. Dinesh Kumar Gupta	CUH	20
5	Prof. Kunwar Pal Singh	DU	19

Table 5 shows that Prof. Margam Madhusudhan (DU) has the highest i10 index of 31 and is leading the list. Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee (BHU) ranked 2 with the i10 index of 26, followed by Prof. Nishat Fatima (AMU) with 21, Prof. Mohammad Nazim (AMU) and Prof. Dinesh Kumar Gupta (CUH) with 20 each and Prof. K.P. Singh (DU) with 19.

5.7 Correlation Between Publication Count and Citation Metrics

The association or relationship between two or more quantitative variables is described using correlation analysis. In this part, we discuss how publication count (i.e., total publication) visible on the GS profile of each LIS faculty correlated with the citation metrics (i.e., citation count, h index & i10 index) available on their GS profile.

A normality test was conducted on the given variables and found that data was not normally distributed. Shapiro-Wilk test has been done to test the normality of the data because the sample number is <50. Therefore, we converted the data of variables into normal distribution by using the log10 method. The test result is displayed in Table 6, which shows that the significant value for all the variables is more than 0.05, indicating that data is normally distributed.

Table 6. Test of normality

Variables	Sig.
Publication count	0.072
Citation count	1.000
h index	0.511
i10index	0.787

Table 7. Correlation between publication count and citation metrics

Correlation between variables	Pearson correlation (r)	Remark
Publication count with citation count	0.644	Positive and Moderate
Publication count with h-index	0.772	Positive and Strong
Publication count with i10 index	0.661	Positive and Moderate

Further, a correlation analysis test was conducted to find the relationship between publication count and citation metrics (Table 7).

Table 7 reveals that the correlation between publication counts available on GS Profile and citation count is "r = 0.644", which shows the positive and moderate relationship between these two variables. The "r =0.772" between publication count and h index on the GS profile shows a positive and strong correlation between these two variables. The "r =0.661" between the publication count and the i10 index also shows a positive and moderate correlation. The correlation in all the cases was at level 0.01, indicating statistically significant results.

The correlation indicates that the visibility of faculties on Google Scholar positively correlates with their citation metrics (citation count, h-index & i10 index). The present study suggests that updating Google Scholar profiles gives faculties better metrics and may positively impact future research prospects.

6. CONCLUSION

Google Scholar provides the academic profiling platform known as Google Scholar profile or Google Scholar Citation Profile and help researchers maximize their online visibility without any paywall. It is evident from the analysis that the faculty who have profiled themselves and their research have greater discoverability and accessibility. Having all of the

researcher's research output in electronic format and linking it to an online profile is the best way to improve the discoverability of research output on the Web. The current study assessed the GS profile of LIS faculty members working in North India Central Universities.

Google Scholar profile has a feature of automatically updating the publications. However, "by choosing 'Automatic Profile Updation,' an author can unethically increase the number of documents, citations and indexes but using this feature of GS, an author can't get exact matrices of his profile"[19]. So, to avoid erroneous entries, faculties should pay more attention to this and delete such entries manually. Furthermore, it is suggested that all the faculties set their profile to public, upload their profile pictures, and provide their affiliation, authentic institutional email id, and link to co-authors. The study also recommends that faculty members display thrust areas to increase the exposure of their areas of interest. This increased exposure to their areas of interest can be used for collaboration by other faculties or researchers with similar interests in India and worldwide.

REFERENCES

1. Adriaanse, L. & Rensleigh, C. E-visibility of environmental science researchers at the University of South Africa. *S. Afr. J. Libr. Inf. Sci.*, 2018, **83(2)**, 30–41. doi: 10.7553/83-2-1636.
2. Maurya, S.K.; Shukla, A. & Ngurtinkhuma, R.K. Measuring the coverage of library and information science (LIS) academia in google scholar and microsoft academic: A scientometric comparison. *Int. J. Inf. Stud. Libr.*, 2019, **4**(2), 11-18.
3. Gasparyan, A.Y.; Nurmashev, B.; Yessirkepov, M.; Endovitskiy, D.A.; Voronov, A.A. & Kitas, G.D. Researcher and author profiles: Opportunities, advantages, and limitations. *J. Korean Med. Sci.*, 2017, **32**(11), 1749–1756. doi:10.3346/jkms.2017.32.11.1749.
4. Maurya, S.K.; Shukla, A. & Ngurtinkhuma, R.K. Exploring research performance of Library and Information Science faculties in google scholar: A scientometric assessment. *J. Indian Libr. Assoc.*, 2021, **57**(3), 121–138.
5. Lateef, A.; Ogunkunle, A.T.J. & Adigun, G.O. Google scholar citation in retrospect: Visibility and contributions of African scholars. *COLLNET J. Sci. Inf. Manage.*, 2016, **10**(2), 219–236. doi:10.1080/09737766.2016.1213966.
6. Francke, H. The academic web profile as a genre of "self-making." *Online Inf. Rev.*, 2019, **43**(5), 760–774. doi: 10.1108/OIR-12-2017-0347.
7. Mikki, S.; Zygmuntowska, M.; Gjesdal, Y.L. & Ruwehy, H.A.Al. Digital presence of norwegian scholars on academic network sites-where and who are they? *PLoS ONE*, 2015, **10**(11). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0142709.
8. R. Rekha & A. Rupesh K. Online scholarly visibility of Indian Library and Information Science teachers: An exploratory study. *Kelpro Bulletin*, 2019, **23**(2),112-117.
9. Kjellberg, S. & Haider, J. Researchers' online visibility: Tensions of visibility, trust and reputation. *Online Inf. Rev.*, 2019, **43**(3), 426–439. doi: 10.1108/OIR-07-2017-0211.
10. Bhattacharyya, N. Research visibility in scopus indexed Journals of LIS and their copyright policies-an empirical study. *In* Panorama of Open Access: Progress, Practices & Prospects*,* edited by Ashis Biswas and Mayuri Das Biswas. Ess Ess Publications, New Delhi,2022,229-241.
11. Ali, M.Y. & Richardson, J. Google scholar citation metrics of Pakistani LIS scholars: An overview. *Global Knowl., Memory Commun.*, 2019, **68**(4–5), 392–412. doi: 10.1108/GKMC-03-2018-0025.
12. Kim, H.J. & Grofman, B. Who creates a Google Scholar profile? *PS - Pol. Sci. Politics*, 2020, **53**(3), 515–520. doi:10.1017/S1049096520000189.
13. Khan, M.A. & Soomro, T.R. Visibility and ethical considerations of Pakistani Universities researchers on Google Scholar. *Int. J. Adv. Comp. Sci. Appl.*, 2021, **12**(2), 201–211. doi:10.14569/IJACSA.2021.0120226.
14. Google Scholar. About Google Scholar. https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/about.html (Accessed on 29 October 2022).
15. Yan, R.; Tang, J.; Liu, X.; Shan, D. & Li, X. Citation count prediction: Learning to estimate future citations for literature. *In* International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, Proceedings, 2011, 1247–1252. doi: 10.1145/2063576.2063757
16. Hirsch, J.E. An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *In* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2005, **102**(46), 16569–16572. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0507655102.
17. Hirsch, J.E., & Buela-Casal, G. Te meaning of the h-index. *Int. J. Clin. Health Psychol.*, 2014, **14**(2), 161–164. doi:10.1016/S1697-2600(14)70050-X.
18. Sangeeta, N.D. Cumulative citations index, h-index and i10-index (research metrics) of an educational institute: A case study. *Int. J. Libr. Inf. Sci.*, 2018, **10**(1), 1–9. doi:10.5897/ijlis2017.0797.
19. Giri, S. & Chakravarty, P. R. Google Scholar adoption by LIS educators in India: An exploratory study. *Libr. Philos. Pract.*, 2021, 1–27.

CONTRIBUTORS

Ms. Pragya Lohia is Junior Research Fellow at Department of Library and Information Sciences, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda. She is a MLISc graduate from University of Delhi. Her areas of interest are: Research visibility, Digital literacy and information literacy.
Her contributions in the current study are: she identified the topic and the methodology to be used. Furthermore, performed data analysis and prepared the paper.

Mr Hari Prakash is a working librarian under the Directorate of Education Govt of Delhi. His areas of interest including Research visibility and History of libraries.
Her contributions in the current study are: Data collection, literature review, and editing of the work.

Appendix I

Metrics of LIS faculty members available on their Google Scholar profile

Name of the faculty	University	Publication count	Citation count	h-index	i10 index	Email for verification	Thrust area
Prof. Nishat Fatima	AMU	96	902	14	21	x	✓
Prof. Naushad Ali P.M	AMU	66	582	11	13	✓	✓
Prof. Sudharma Haridasan	AMU	13	214	05	02	x	✓
Prof. M. Masoom Raza	AMU	60	264	07	05	✓	✓
Prof. Mehtab Alam Ansari	AMU	30	246	06	04	x	✓
Dr. Mohammad Nazim	AMU	58	688	16	20	✓	✓
Dr. Muzamil Mushtaq	AMU	48	59	05	02	✓	✓
Prof. Shilpi Verma	BBAU	57	75	06	02	✓	x
Prof. K. L. Mahawar	BBAU	25	64	06	02	✓	x
Prof. M. P. Singh	BBAU	55	112	07	03	x	x
Dr. Sharad Kumar Sonker	BBAU	81	309	10	10	✓	✓
Dr. Vinit Kumar	BBAU	37	135	06	02	✓	✓
Mr. Somipam R. Shimray	BBAU	20	123	06	02	✓	✓
Prof. Bhaskar Mukherjee	BHU	56	819	18	26	✓	✓
Dr. Rajani Mishra	BHU	20	144	05	03	✓	✓
Dr. Kunwar Singh	BHU	60	268	09	09	✓	✓
Dr. Gireesh Kumar T.K.	BHU	55	109	05	02	✓	✓
Prof. Dinesh Kumar Gupta	CUH	42	627	15	20	✓	✓
Dr. Shri Ram Pandey	CUH	42	121	06	04	✓	✓
Dr. Rishabh Shrivastava	CUP	07	138	05	04	✓	✓
Mr.Somesh Rai	CUP	09	32	03	01	✓	✓
Dr. Sukhdev Singh	CUP	27	27	03	01	✓	✓
Dr. Florence Guite	CUP	06	02	01	00	✓	✓
Prof. Rakesh Kumar Bhatt	DU	53	371	11	12	✓	✓
Prof. Paramjeet Kaur Walia	DU	33	293	10	11	x	✓
Prof. Kunwar Pal Singh	DU	102	768	16	19	✓	✓
Prof.Margam Madhusudhan	DU	162	1715	18	31	✓	✓
Prof. Meera	DU	10	41	05	01	✓	✓
Prof. Uma Kanjilal	IGNOU	72	185	07	04	x	x
Dr. Jaideep Sharma	IGNOU	49	304	08	07	✓	x
Prof. Archana Shukla	IGNOU	12	108	05	03	✓	x