
Research Trends in Social Science Subjects in Annamalai University: A Study

S. Rajeshwari

Assistant Professor, Library and Information Science Wing, Annamalai University.
Annamalai Nagar – 608 002,

M. Nagarajan

Prof.&Head,Dept.of Library and Information science,Annamalai University

Abstract

The paper presents the contribution of Arts faculties of Annamalai University. Describes the year wise growth and form wise distribution of the research output. Studies the impact of research under different existing Social Science & Arts departments of the University and analyses the strong and weak areas of University research, collaborative nature of research in terms of the authorship pattern. The results shows that there is significant growth of research productivity in the faculty of Arts during the period of study with less collaboration.

Keywords

Faculty of Arts, Paper Publication, Research Output

Electronic access

The journal is available at www.jalis.in



Journal of Advances in Library and Information Science
ISSN: 2277-2219
Vol.1. No.1.Jan-Mar 2012. pp. 39-43.

Introduction

The production of new knowledge through the practices of research and scholarship lies at the heart of the university's mission. The research output of the university scientists in the form of research papers in peer-reviewed scholarly journals is being considered as one of the main criteria for assessing the performance of the university scientists and faculties.

Bibliometrics is emerged as a research front in its own right in information science. It is a set of methods used to study or measure texts and information. Citation analysis and content analysis are commonly used Bibliometric methods. Bibliometrics are now used in quantitative research assessment exercises of academic output. Research publications are clearly one of the quantitative measures of the basic research activity in a country or an institution. The institution, which generates a good number of the research papers in a particular field, is considered as a frontier institution in that field. Such studies help decision makers and policy planners in the respective field to make available adequate facilities and direct the research activities in proper direction. Analysis of the publication output can be a valuable tool in mapping existing situation.

Relative Research Literature

Various studies have been conducted in the past analyzing the contribution and impact of individual organizations Kaur and Aggrawal (2010) brought out the results of a bibliometric study of research publications of department of Chemistry, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar for the period 2002-2006. Bhatia (2010) studied quantitatively research publications published by the scientists of National Institute of Occupational Health (ICMR) Ahmadabad, India during 2002-2006. Gupta and Dhawan (2008) studied Growth and impact of research output of University of Mysore for the period of 1996-2006. Multitudes of like studies were undertaken to assess the Science and technology research in various institutions but the assessment of research productivity of arts faculties has not been conducted so far. The present study is attributed to the research productivity of the faculties of Arts, Annamalai University.

The Annamalai University is one of the largest residential universities in the country founded by Hon'ble Dr. Rajah Sir Annamalai Chettiar. It was

started as the Minakshi College in 1920, became University in 1929 and presently it has 48 departments of study. It has student strength of about 40,000 pursuing different regular programmes of study. The University has 11 departments (table 1) under the faculties of Arts.

Table 1 Departments in faculties of Arts

Departments in faculty of Arts	Year of establishment
English	1929
History	1929
Political Science and Public Administration	1981
Economics	1929
Sociology	1954
Commerce	1955
Population Studies	1976
Business Administration	1978
Library and Information Science	1979
Philosophy	1929
Centre for Rural Development	1990

2. Objectives of the study

The main objectives of present study are:

- ❖ To analyze the year wise distribution of the research output of the faculties of Arts of Annamalai University between 2006 to 2010;
- ❖ To study the department wise output of the faculties of Arts and to identify strong and weak disciplines of Faculties of Arts with reference to the research output.
- ❖ To analyse the form wise distribution of research output
- ❖ To analyse the authorship pattern of the research output
- ❖ To study the collaborative efforts by the academics of Annamalai University

3. Methodology of the study

The present study uses 5 years publication output data from 2006-2010 to understand the broad characteristics of the research output of the Arts faculties of the University. The data for the study was taken from the Annual report of the University from 2006-2010 which were then tabulated and analysed.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Year wise Growth of research output

Table 2 shows the growth rate of research output by the faculty members of Annamalai University. It could be noted that during the five years of study, the publication output rose significantly, from 180(7.83%) contribution in 2006 to 775 (33.72%) in 2010.

Table 2- Year wise Growth of research output

Year	No. of Research Output	Percentage	Cumulative total no. of research output	Cumulative percentage
2006	180	7.83%	180	7.83%
2007	361	15.70%	541	23.53%
2008	427	18.57%	968	42.1%
2009	556	24.18%	1524	66.28%
2010	775	33.72%	2299	100.0%
Total	2299	100.0%		

4.2 Department wise distribution of Research output

There are 11 departments under the arts faculty of the University. The publication output of the departments is given in table 3. The department of Commerce top with 607 publication which is 26.40percent of the total contribution. The second ranks is to department of Business administration with 510 (22.18%) publications. The less number of publication is brought out by the Centre for Rural Development, i.e 34 (1.48%) publications. The reason is the faculty members in the topped departments is more in number than the other departments.

Table 3- Department wise distribution of Research output

S. No	Department	No.of research output	Percentage	Cumulative total no. of research output	Cumulative percentage
1.	Department of English	79	3.44	79	3.44
2.	Department of History	254	11.05	333	14.49
3.	Department of Political Science	212	9.22	545	23.71
4.	Department of Economics	197	8.57	742	32.28
5.	Department of Sociology	193	8.39	935	40.67
6.	Department of Commerce	607	26.40	1542	67.07
7.	Centre of Population studies	44	1.91	1586	68.98
8.	Department of Business Administration	510	22.18	2096	91.16
9.	Department of Library and Information Science	91	3.96	2187	95.12
10.	Department of Philosophy	78	3.39	2265	98.52
11.	Centre for Rural Development	34	1.48	2299	100.0
	Total	2299	100.0		

4.3 Form wise distribution of research output

Table 4 presents the form wise distribution of research output which reveals that 43.93percent of the publication are distributed as journal article, 19.44percent in conference proceedings, 36.23percent in seminar volumes and only 0.40percent is published as books.

Table 4- Form wise distribution of research output

S. No.	Forms	No. of research output	percentage	Cumulative Total no. of research output	Cumulative percentage
1.	Journal articles	1010	43.93	1010	43.93
2.	Conference proceedings	447	19.44	1457	63.37
3.	Seminar volume	833	36.23	2290	99.6
4.	Books	9	0.40	2299	100.0
	Total	2299	100.0		

4.4 Authorship patterns

On examining the authorship patterns of the research productivity (table 5) , single authorship contribution predominates with 1647 (71.63) publications; 499 (21.7) publication are contributed by two authors; 136 (5.92) publications are contributed by three authors and only 3 publications are with more than four authors.

Table 5- Authorship patterns

S.No.	Author	No. of research output	percentage	Cumulative Total no.of research output	Cumulative percentage
1.	One	1647	71.63	1647	71.63
2.	Two	499	21.70	2146	93.33
3.	Three	136	5.92	2282	99.25
4.	Four	14	0.60	2296	99.85
5.	Above four	3	0.15	2299	100.0
	Total	2299	100.0		

4.6 Collaboration of the research

As per the authorship pattern, there are 1647 papers which are single authored and only 652 which is multiple authored (Table-6) which points out that there is least collaboration in the research activities in the arts faculties of the Annamalai University. Extend of collaboration can be measured with the help of multi- authored papers. The coefficient is the ratio of the number of collaborative research papers during a certain period of time. As per the formula given by K.Subramanyam (1983), for determining the degree of collaboration in a discipline, the value of collaboration will be between 0 and 1.

To determine the degree of collaboration of publications,, the number of single authored and multi-authored publications is calculated and is applied to the formula:. $C = Nm/Nm + Ns$

C= Degree of Collaboration

Nm= Number of multi authored works

Ns= Number of single authored works

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Here } C &= 652/229 \\ &= 0.28 \end{aligned}$$

Hence the Degree of Collaboration of publications of the Arts faculties of the Annamalai University is 0.28

Table 6- Collaboration of the research

S.No.	Authorship patterns	No.of research output	percentage	Cumulative Total no.of research output	Cumulative percentage
1.	Single Author	1647	72.60%	1647	72.60%
2.	Multiple Author	652	28.30%	2299	100.0%
	Total	2299	100.0%		

5. Findings and suggestions

The research output shows a continuous increase during the period of study which reveals that the departments under the faculty of arts are successful in carrying out research activities. Those departments which show a decrease in the output needs to be further encouraged. Most of the papers are published as journal articles. There is also papers published in the seminar volume and conference proceedings which indicates that faculties are getting enough opportunities to present their papers in conferences and seminars. The authorship pattern shows that there is more single authored papers than multi authored and also there is a decline in the degree of collaboration of research activities. To increase collaboration in research output, the participatory

research activities need to be encouraged which will improve the quality of research.

The research productivity can be increased by improving further the research environment, upgrading the infrastructural facilities, recruiting more qualified faculty and increasing the participation in research activities. More incentives, rewards, and encouragement should be given to the faculty members for publishing in high impact journals. In addition, faculty should be encouraged to conduct participatory research projects with other university departments so that their interaction with the outside world can be increased. Also, the existing library and information facilities in the university should be strengthened and access to electronic resources should be provided.

References

Bhatia, K. (2010). Innovations publications productivity of National Institute of Occupational Health: A scientometric study. *SRELS Journal of Information Management*, 47(2), 219-227.

Gupta, B. M. and Dhawan, S. M. (2008). Growth and Impact of Research Output of University of Mysore, 1996-2006: A Case Study. *Annals of Library and Information Studies*, 55(3), 185-195.

Kaur, Amritpal and Aggrawal, Sangeeta. (2010). Bibliometric analysis of research publications of Department of Chemistry, Gurunanak Dev University, Amritsar. *IASLIC Bulletin*, 55 (1) 20-28.

Subramanyam, K. (1983) Bibliometric studies of research collaboration: A Review. *Journal of information science*, 6 (1), 33-38.

Sudhier K.G., and Abhila I S Publication Productivity of Social Scientists in the Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram: A Bibliometric Analysis Accessed from <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/dxml/bitstream/handle/1944/1654/62.pdf?sequence=1>

The University's Role in the Dissemination of Research and Scholarship *EDUCAUSE Review*, 44(2) (March/April 2009): 6-7. Accessed from <http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Review/EDUCAUSEReviewMagazineVolume44/TheUniversitysRoleintheDissemi/163801>