Street Art & Urban Creativity | Vol. 12, No. 2s, 2026 | ISSN 2183-9956
Street Art & Urban Creativity. Scientific Journ

Citation Patterns of LIS Faculty: A Case Study of Research Productivity

Mr. Mangesh Shamrao Karambe[1], Mr. Gautam Amrut Wani[2], Dr. Manohar Bhaurao Bandre[3], Dr. Sudhir Astunkar[4], Dr. Sarika Manikrao Sable [5*]

[1]Librarian Department of Library and Information Science Gondwana University, Gadchiroli, Maharashtra, India

[2]Librarian Library and Information Science Netaji Subhash Chandra Science College, Mulchera, Gadchiroli, Maharashtra, India Affiliated Gondwana University, Gadchiroli

[3]Librarian, Mahatma Gandhi College of Science, Gadchandur, Maharashtra, India Gondwana University, Gadchiroli, Maharashtra, India

[4]Ph. Research Guide Department of Library and Information Science Gondwana University, Gadchiroli, Maharashtra, India

Correspondence Author:

[5]College Librarian Shree shivaji Arts, commerce & Science College, Rajura Department of Library and Information Science University: Gondwana University, Gadchiroli, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

This research provides a comprehensive examination of citation patterns and research productivity among Library and Information Science (LIS) faculty members, with particular emphasis on the Indian academic context. Drawing on a range of empirical studies, including Shaw and Vaughan's foundational work profiling the "typical professor" and recent Indian studies on faculty research performance, this paper analyzes how publication output, citation impact, academic rank, institutional type, and collaboration patterns interact to shape scholarly influence. The study employs scientometric and bibliometric approaches to evaluate research productivity across multiple databases, comparing the coverage of Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. Key findings reveal significant asymmetries in research output among LIS faculty, with a small number of highly productive authors accounting for a disproportionate share of publications and citations. The analysis demonstrates that full professors publish significantly more than faculty at other ranks, while assistant professors show higher conference paper output compared to journal articles. Furthermore, faculty in doctoral-granting institutions demonstrate substantially higher productivity than their counterparts in non-doctoral programs. Google Scholar reveals citation impact that is often invisible in Web of Science. The study also documents collaboration patterns and the preference for journals as primary citation sources. The findings underscore the limitations of volume-based evaluation metrics and advocate for more nuanced, inequality-sensitive assessment frameworks that account for individual, institutional, and disciplinary differences in citation and productivity patterns.

Keywords: Citation Analysis, Research Productivity, LIS Faculty, Bibliometrics, Scientometrics, Academic Evaluation, Publication Patterns, Citation Impact, Indian Universities, Google Scholar.

1. Introduction

The assessment of research productivity and citation impact has become a central concern in academic institutions worldwide. In Library and Information Science (LIS), as in other disciplines, faculty members are evaluated based on their publication records, citation counts, and overall scholarly influence. These metrics serve multiple purposes: they inform hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions; they determine institutional rankings and funding allocations; and they contribute to understanding the intellectual structure and evolution of the discipline itself.

Citation analysis, a core method in bibliometrics, examines the patterns and frequencies with which scholarly works are cited by other researchers. This approach provides insights into the impact, influence, and intellectual connections within a field. As Shaw and Vaughan (2008) observed, citation patterns reveal not just which works are being used, but also the structures of knowledge dissemination and the factors that differentiate productive scholars from their peers .

The Indian LIS academic landscape has experienced significant growth over the past two decades. With the expansion of higher education and the increasing emphasis on research output as a measure of institutional quality, understanding the citation and publication patterns of LIS faculty has become crucial. Recent studies have examined the online visibility of Indian LIS educators , their citation behavior in doctoral theses , and the asymmetrical distribution of research productivity across central universities .

This research contributes to this growing body of knowledge by providing a comprehensive case study of citation patterns among LIS faculty. The analysis draws on empirical data from multiple sources, including foundational international studies and recent Indian research, to identify patterns, trends, and recommendations for enhancing research productivity and impact.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1. Citation Analysis

Citation analysis is a bibliometric method that examines the frequency, patterns, and contexts of citations in scholarly literature. It is used to assess the impact of individual works, authors, journals, and institutions, and to trace intellectual connections within a discipline. Citation analysis assumes that citations represent acknowledgment of intellectual influence, though this assumption has been subject to critique.

2.2. Research Productivity

Research productivity refers to the quantity and quality of scholarly output produced by an individual, group, or institution over a given period. In LIS, productivity is typically measured by publication counts, citation counts, and author-level metrics such as the h-index and i10-index .

2.3. Bibliometrics

Bibliometrics is the quantitative analysis of publications and citation patterns. It employs statistical methods to examine the characteristics and evolution of scholarly communication, including authorship patterns, journal distributions, and citation networks .

2.4. Scientometrics

Scientometrics is a subfield of bibliometrics that specifically focuses on the quantitative study of science and scientific research. It examines scientific productivity, collaboration patterns, and the dynamics of knowledge production .

2.5. h-index

The h-index, proposed by Jorge Hirsch, is an author-level metric that attempts to measure both the productivity and citation impact of a researcher. An author has an h-index of h if h of their publications have at least h citations each. The h-index has become a widely used metric in academic evaluation, though it has been subject to various critiques .

2.6. Gini Coefficient

The Gini coefficient is a measure of statistical dispersion that is commonly used to assess inequality in distributions. In the context of research productivity, the Gini coefficient can indicate the degree of concentration or asymmetry in publication and citation patterns among a group of scholars .

2.7. Collaboration Patterns

Collaboration patterns refer to the ways in which researchers work together to produce scholarly work. In LIS, collaboration can be measured by the number of co-authors per

publication, the proportion of multi-authored papers, and the degree of national versus international collaboration. Research has shown that international collaboration significantly improves publication quality and citation impact .

2.8. Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar

These are the three major databases used for citation analysis:

1. Web of Science (WoS) : A subscription-based citation database maintained by Clarivate Analytics, providing comprehensive coverage of high-impact journals across disciplines .

2. Scopus: A subscription-based database maintained by Elsevier, offering broader journal coverage than WoS .

3.Google Scholar (GS) : A freely accessible web search engine that indexes scholarly literature across a wide range of formats, including journal articles, conference papers, theses, and books. GS has been shown to locate more citations than WoS for many LIS faculty members .

3. NEED FOR THE STUDY

3.1. Understanding LIS Research Culture

The academic culture in Library and Information Science differs from many other disciplines in terms of publication practices, collaboration norms, and citation behaviors. Understanding these unique patterns is essential for appropriate evaluation and support of LIS faculty .

3.2. Evaluation and Career Advancement

Citation and publication patterns directly impact academic careers. Hiring, promotion, tenure, and funding decisions increasingly rely on bibliometric indicators. A clear understanding of what constitutes typical or exceptional productivity in LIS is necessary for fair and transparent evaluation .

3.3. Asymmetry and Inequality in Research Output

Recent research has documented significant asymmetries in research productivity among LIS faculty. Some scholars contribute disproportionately to the field's output, while others publish little or are cited infrequently. Understanding the factors that contribute to this asymmetry is essential for developing policies that support equitable research participation .

3.4. Institutional Benchmarking

Universities and LIS departments need benchmarks to assess their research performance relative to peers. Citation analysis provides a basis for such comparisons, helping institutions identify strengths and areas for improvement .

3.5. Database Coverage and Visibility

Different citation databases offer different levels of coverage for LIS research. Understanding the strengths and limitations of Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar in the LIS context is crucial for accurate assessment of research impact ..

4. AIMS OF THE STUDY

The primary aim of this research is to examine the citation patterns and research productivity of Library and Information Science faculty, with a particular focus on the Indian academic context, through a comprehensive bibliometric and scientometric analysis.

5. OBJECTIVES

1.To analyze the publication patterns of LIS faculty across different academic ranks (assistant professor, associate professor, full professor) and institution types (doctoral-granting vs. non-doctoral programs).

2.To examine citation patterns and impact, comparing coverage across Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar.

3.To identify highly productive LIS authors and their contribution patterns in the Indian context.

4.To analyze collaboration patterns among LIS faculty, including authorship and co-authorship trends.

5.To assess the asymmetry and inequality in research productivity using measures such as the Gini coefficient.

6.To examine citation preferences, including the age of cited materials and preferred publication formats.

7.To identify the relationship between publication volume and citation impact.

8.To propose recommendations for enhancing research productivity and impact in LIS.

6. HYPOTHESIS

H0: There is no significant relationship between academic rank and research productivity or citation impact among LIS faculty.

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between academic rank and research productivity and citation impact among LIS faculty.

H2: Citation patterns and research productivity among LIS faculty show significant asymmetry, with a small number of highly productive authors accounting for a disproportionate share of publications and citations.

H3: Google Scholar provides significantly broader citation coverage for LIS faculty than Web of Science and Scopus.

7. LITERATURE SEARCH

7.1 Foundational Studies on LIS Publication and Citation Patterns

Shaw and Vaughan's (2008) seminal study, "Publication and citation patterns among LIS faculty: Profiling a 'typical professor'," established a foundational framework for understanding LIS research productivity. The study used a random sample of faculty from ALA-accredited programs and found that publication output increases steadily with academic rank. Assistant professors published more conference papers and fewer journal articles, a pattern reversed with associate and full professors. Critically, the study found that Web of Science reported no citations for most LIS faculty publications, while Google Scholar's broader coverage revealed significantly more citations. Full professors' works were cited significantly more frequently than those of assistant or associate professors. Faculty at doctoral-granting institutions published significantly more than those at institutions without doctoral programs.

7.2 Indian Studies on LIS Faculty Research Productivity

Recent research has focused specifically on the Indian LIS academic landscape. Maurya, Shukla, and Ngurtinkhuma (2024) explored the research performance of LIS faculties based on Google Scholar, identifying top productive authors, citation patterns, and preferred research areas. Their study found significant variations in publications and citations, with growth in publications but fluctuations in citations. They also noted that inter- and intra-departmental collaboration is weak among LIS faculties .

Munshi, Barsha, Pal, and Faizan (2024) examined the Google Scholar and Scopus citation profiles of LIS faculty members in Indian central universities. Their study revealed that 78 out of 104 faculty members had GS profiles, while 61 had Scopus profiles. They found no straightforward correlation between publication volume and citation metrics, suggesting that some faculty members with modest publication counts nevertheless receive substantial citations .

7.3 Citation Analysis of Doctoral Theses

Singh, Kumar, and Singh (2026) conducted a citation analysis of doctoral theses submitted to leading Indian LIS universities. Analyzing 18,638 references, they found that PhD-level LIS scholars cite, on average, materials that are 32 years old, with an average of 132.18 references per thesis. They recommended that LIS academics pay greater attention to emerging research ideas rather than relying heavily on established concepts .

7.4 Asymmetry and Inequality in Research Output

Singson, Karunakaran, and Sampath (2026) investigated the asymmetrical distribution of research productivity, publication quality, and citations among LIS faculty in central universities. Using a multidimensional scientometric approach with Scopus data from 120 faculty members across 22 universities, they found significant concentration of research productivity and citations among a small group of faculty. They demonstrated that international collaboration significantly improves publication quality and citation impact .

7.5 Database Coverage and Visibility

Multiple studies have compared the coverage of Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar for LIS research. Shaw and Vaughan (2008) noted that WoS reported no citations for most LIS publications, while GS located substantially more citations . Munshi et al. (2024) similarly found that Indian LIS faculty had more substantial publication records on GS than on Scopus .

7.6 Online Presence and Research Visibility

Giri and Chakravarty (2025) studied the online presence and research visibility of Indian LIS educators using Google Scholar data. They found that Prof. Manoj Kumar Verma stands out for exceptional productivity, with 331 publications over 16 years. They also identified Prof. Thanuskodi S as the leader in total citations (2,703) and annual citations (180.2) .

7.7 Bibliometric Studies of Indian LIS Faculty

A study of LIS faculty from central universities using Web of Science data found that out of 81 faculty across 18 central universities, data was available for 42 faculty from 14 institutions. Bhaskar Mukherjee of BHU contributed the highest number of publications (44, 23.03%), followed by Mohammad Nazim of AMU (28, 14.65%), and M. Madhusudhan of DU (13, 6.8%). The average publication per faculty was 4.54, but only 11 faculties had four or more publications .

A bibliometric study of LIS faculty from the West Zone of India examined 13 universities and 37 permanent faculty members, analyzing authorship patterns, degree of collaboration, and preferred journals. The study found that journals are the most favored source of citations, contributing 54.46% of all references .

8. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

8.1 Research Design

This study employs a descriptive, analytical, and quantitative research design, combining bibliometric and scientometric methods to analyze citation patterns and research productivity of LIS faculty.

8.2 Data Sources

The study relies on multiple data sources:

1.**Web of Science Core Collection:** Provides citation data for publications indexed in the social science domain, focusing on LIS faculty from central universities .

2.**Scopus:** A broader database for publication and citation data, used for the analysis of 120 faculty across 22 central universities .

3.**Google Scholar:** A freely accessible database with broader coverage, used for citation metrics, visibility analysis, and profiling of Indian LIS educators .

4.**University Websites:** Accessed to determine the list of LIS faculty and their institutional affiliations .

8.3 Sample Selection

The study draws on multiple samples:

1.For international comparison, the Shaw and Vaughan (2008) sample of faculty from ALA-accredited programs .

2.For Indian data, samples from central universities (42-120 faculty across 14-22 universities) .

3.For online visibility, data on Indian LIS educators from Google Scholar profiles .

8.4 Data Collection Methods

Data collection involved:

1.Manual searches of Google Scholar and Scopus profiles using faculty names and affiliations .

2.Automated searches of Web of Science Core Collection, using author search fields and institutional filters .

3.Extraction of publication and citation data from university websites and research profiling platforms .

8.5 Analytical Tools

Data analysis utilized several software tools:

1.**Microsoft Excel:** For basic statistical calculations and tabular presentations .

2.**Bibliometrix and R-Package:** For bibliometric analysis and visualization .

3.**VOSviewer:** For mapping and visualizing citation networks and collaboration patterns .

4.**Gini Coefficient and Lorenz Curves:** For measuring inequality in research distribution .

5.**Quality-Equity Ratio (QER) :** For assessing the relationship between volume and quality .

8.6 Metrics Used

The study employs various bibliometric indicators:

1.**Publication Count:** Total number of publications per faculty member .

2.**Citation Count:** Total number of citations received .

3.**h-index:** Combined measure of productivity and impact .

4.**i10-index:** Number of publications with at least 10 citations .

5.**g-index:** An h-index variant that emphasizes highly cited papers .

6.**Collaboration Measures:** Authorship patterns, degree of collaboration, and co-authorship networks .

8.7 Limitations

1.Database coverage variations may affect citation counts, with Google Scholar providing broader coverage than WoS and Scopus .

2.The study focuses primarily on central universities and may not represent all Indian LIS faculty .

3.Document types in Google Scholar are not always clearly defined, which is considered a limitation .

4.The study relies on secondary data rather than primary surveys.

9. STRONG POINTS OF RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY ASSESSMENT

9.1 Comprehensive Multi-Database Approach

One of the significant strengths of recent research productivity studies is the use of multiple citation databases. By comparing Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar, researchers can capture a more complete picture of scholarly impact. As Shaw and Vaughan (2008) demonstrated, Google Scholar reveals citations that are invisible in Web of Science, providing a fuller assessment of research impact . Similarly, Munshi et al. (2024) showed that faculty members have substantially more publications indexed in GS than in Scopus .

9.2 Use of Multiple Bibliometric Indicators

Modern research productivity assessment employs a range of indicators beyond simple publication counts. The h-index, i10-index, g-index, and Quality-Equity Ratio provide more nuanced assessments that account for both quantity and quality . This multi-indicator approach addresses the limitations of relying on any single metric.

9.3 Inequality-Sensitive Assessment

Recent research has moved beyond aggregate measures to examine the distribution of productivity within institutions. The use of Gini coefficients and Lorenz curves provides valuable insight into asymmetry and concentration of research output . This approach acknowledges that

a small number of highly productive authors may account for a disproportionate share of output, which may be obscured by average or aggregate measures.

9.4 Quality-Equity Framework

The introduction of the Quality-Equity Ratio (QER) represents a significant methodological advance. The QER allows researchers to assess whether higher publication volume predicts higher quartile journal publication. Studies have shown that higher publication volume does not necessarily predict higher quality output, suggesting that volume-based evaluation systems are inadequate .

9.5 Institutional Benchmarking

These studies provide valuable benchmarks for institutional assessment. Universities can compare their LIS faculty's productivity and citation patterns against national norms, identifying areas for improvement and investment .

9.6 Identification of Top Performers

The identification of highly productive and highly cited scholars provides role models for early-career researchers and insights into what practices contribute to scholarly success. For example, Prof. Manoj Kumar Verma's productivity (20.68 publications per year over 16 years) and Prof. Thanuskodi's citation leadership (2,703 total citations) offer benchmarks for Indian LIS research .

9.7 Collaboration Analysis

Examination of collaboration patterns provides insights into the social structure of LIS research. The finding that international collaboration significantly improves publication quality and citation impact has important implications for institutional policy .

9.8 Citation Age Analysis

Analysis of the age of cited materials provides insights into how LIS researchers use prior knowledge. The finding that Indian PhD scholars cite, on average, 32-year-old materials suggests a disciplinary tendency to build on established concepts . This insight can inform research training and curriculum design.

10. WEAK POINTS OF RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY ASSESSMENT

10.1 Database Coverage Limitations

Different databases provide different coverage, which can significantly affect productivity and impact assessments. Web of Science has relatively limited coverage of LIS journals, particularly those published in languages other than English . Even Scopus, with broader coverage, may not capture all LIS research . Google Scholar, while more comprehensive, has unclear document type classifications and may include non-peer-reviewed materials .

10.2 Time Lag in Citation Accumulation

Citation metrics are inherently retrospective. A recent publication may be highly significant but have not yet accumulated citations. This time lag particularly affects early-career researchers, for whom citation counts may be low despite significant early contributions . The study by Shaw and Vaughan (2008) showed that works by professors are cited significantly more frequently than those of assistant professors, but this may partly reflect the longer time available to accumulate citations rather than solely productivity differences .

10.3 Self-Citation and Gaming

Citation metrics can be manipulated through self-citation and citation cartels. While self-citation is legitimate in some contexts, excessive self-citation can inflate apparent impact . Bibliometric assessments should account for this through normalization or by examining self-citation rates.

10.4 Volume vs. Quality Trade-offs

Higher publication volume does not necessarily predict higher quality output. Studies have

found that the Quality-Equity Ratio (QER) can reveal that high-volume departments do not necessarily publish in higher-quartile journals . Reliance on volume-based metrics may incentivize quantity over quality, leading to what has been termed "publish or perish" culture.

10.5 Disciplinary Differences

LIS differs from many other disciplines in its publication practices. The field has a strong tradition of conference paper publication, particularly for early-career researchers . Journal article publication patterns also differ, with faculty at doctoral-granting institutions publishing more than those in non-doctoral programs . These disciplinary norms must be considered in assessment frameworks.

10.6 Variation by Institution Type

Institutional context significantly affects publication and citation patterns. Faculty at doctoral-granting institutions publish significantly more than those in non-doctoral programs . This variation may reflect differences in research expectations and resources rather than individual ability.

10.7 Regional and National Differences

Research publication and citation patterns vary significantly across regions and countries. Faculty in different countries may favor different publication formats, have different access to databases, and face different institutional expectations. Assessment frameworks must account for this variation.

10.8 Collaboration Dynamics and Authorship Attribution

Collaboration patterns raise issues for authorship attribution. Highly collaborative research may involve many authors, making it difficult to attribute contributions and assess individual productivity. In LIS, the degree of collaboration is still relatively low compared to the sciences, but it is increasing .

11. CURRENT TRENDS

11.1 Shift toward Author-Level Metrics

There has been a significant shift from journal-level metrics (e.g., impact factors) to author-level metrics (h-index, i10-index, g-index). This shift reflects a growing recognition that individual assessment requires individual-level indicators.

11.2 Inequality-Sensitive Assessment

Institutional assessment is increasingly acknowledging inequality in research distribution. The use of Gini coefficients and Lorenz curves to visualize concentration patterns is a recent trend, with studies revealing substantial variation even within top universities .

11.3 Quality-Equity Integration

The Quality-Equity Ratio (QER) represents an emerging trend toward assessing both quality and equity simultaneously. This approach acknowledges that high-volume departments may not necessarily publish in high-impact venues .

11.4 International Collaboration

International collaboration has been shown to significantly improve publication quality and citation impact. This has led to institutional policies that encourage international research partnerships. The finding that LIS collaboration dynamics are evolving, with more international co-authorship, reflects this trend .

11.5 Digital Visibility as a Supplementary Metric

Researchers increasingly value online presence and digital visibility as supplementary metrics. The study by Giri and Chakravarty (2025) represents an emerging trend of analyzing research visibility through Google Scholar, measuring online impact rather than traditional citation metrics .

11.6 Scopus for Institutional Assessment

Scopus has gained prominence for institutional assessment due to its broader coverage and user-friendly interfaces . However, Google Scholar remains important for capturing a wider range of LIS publications and providing citation data that complements traditional databases.

11.7 Emphasis on Research Training and Mentorship

Research on LIS faculty productivity has important implications for doctoral education. Supervisors and LIS departments can use findings to guide doctoral research methodologies, shifting toward more contemporary research and innovative concepts . This insight is influencing research training and curriculum focus.

12. HISTORY OF CITATION STUDIES IN LIS

12.1 Early Bibliometric Studies

The application of bibliometric methods to LIS scholarship has a long history. Early studies focused on journal-level analysis, examining citation patterns to identify core journals and understand knowledge dissemination. This foundational work established the importance of citation analysis for understanding the intellectual structure of LIS.

12.2 The Shift to Author-Level Analysis

Shaw and Vaughan's (2008) study represented a shift from institutional and journal-level analysis to author-level analysis. By profiling a "typical professor," they provided a framework for understanding variation across academic ranks, institution types, and career stages. Their finding that Google Scholar reveals more citations than Web of Science has been highly influential .

12.3 Indian LIS Citation Studies

Indian bibliometric studies of LIS have grown significantly since 2010. Early studies focused on individual journals, specific institutions, or doctoral theses. More recent studies have adopted a broader scope, examining multiple universities and employing sophisticated analytical tools .

12.4 The Evolution of Analytical Tools

The development of software tools for bibliometric analysis has transformed the field. VOSviewer, Bibliometrix, and the R-package have enabled more sophisticated network analysis, visualization, and statistical testing . This has allowed researchers to map collaboration patterns, examine keyword co-occurrence, and identify research trends.

12.5 Database Evolution

The evolution of citation databases has also shaped the field. Web of Science has been the established gold standard for citation analysis, but Scopus emerged as a broader alternative, and Google Scholar provided free access to citation data . The growing availability of citation data has democratized research in this area.

12.6 Policy and Practice Impact

Citation analysis has had significant impact on academic policy and practice. Universities increasingly use bibliometric indicators in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. Funding agencies use citation data in grant evaluations. The field has also influenced research training, with guidelines for doctoral dissertations often referencing citation analysis findings .

13. DISCUSSION

13.1 Publication Patterns and Academic Rank

The evidence across multiple studies confirms a significant relationship between academic rank and publication productivity. Full professors publish significantly more than faculty at other ranks, reflecting a career-long accumulation of publications . However, there is no significant difference between assistant and associate professors in terms of publication volume, suggesting a plateau in publication rates after reaching associate rank.

The type of publications also varies by rank. Assistant professors publish more conference

papers, while associate and full professors publish more journal articles . This reflects the different career pressures and opportunities faced by early-career researchers, who often present at conferences to build networks, and more established researchers, who focus on journal publication.

13.2 Citation Impact Across Ranks

Faculty rank is also associated with citation impact. Full professors' works are cited significantly more frequently than those of assistant or associate professors . However, this may reflect the longer time available to accumulate citations rather than a difference in research quality. Assistant professors' publications may be as significant but have not yet had time to generate citations .

13.3 Institutional Context and Productivity

Institutional type is significantly associated with publication productivity. Faculty at schools granting doctoral degrees publish significantly more than their counterparts in institutions without doctoral programs or where the doctoral degree is offered jointly with other academic units . This likely reflects differences in research expectations, resources, and the availability of doctoral students as research collaborators.

13.4 Asymmetry and Inequality in Research Productivity

The analysis reveals significant asymmetry in research productivity among LIS faculty. A small number of highly productive authors account for a disproportionate share of publications and citations . At some universities, this concentration is particularly pronounced. The Gini coefficient analysis suggests that aggregate performance metrics obscure substantial intra-institutional inequality.

13.5 The Volume-Quality Relationship

Higher publication volume does not necessarily predict higher quality output. Studies using the Quality-Equity Ratio (QER) have found that high-volume departments do not necessarily publish in higher quartile journals . This suggests that volume-based evaluation systems are inadequate for assessing research quality.

13.6 Collaboration Dynamics

Collaboration patterns significantly affect research productivity. National and international collaboration improves publication quality, quantity, and citation impact . However, collaboration in LIS is still relatively low compared to other fields, particularly in India . There is potential for increased collaboration, particularly across institutions and national borders, to enhance research impact.

13.7 Database Choice and Citation Visibility

The choice of citation database significantly affects the visibility of LIS research. Google Scholar provides broader coverage than Web of Science and Scopus, revealing citations that are invisible in the other databases . This suggests that exclusive reliance on Web of Science or Scopus may underestimate the impact of LIS research. However, Google Scholar's less granular data classification presents challenges for precise analysis .

13.8 Citation Age and Disciplinary Traditions

The average age of cited materials in LIS (32 years in Indian PhD theses) suggests that LIS scholars draw on established concepts over extended periods . This reflects a disciplinary tradition that values foundational works and a slower pace of knowledge replacement compared to fields like the natural sciences. This insight has implications for research training: supervisors and LIS departments can use findings to guide doctoral research toward more contemporary and innovative approaches .

13.9 Practical Implications for Evaluation

The findings have significant implications for how LIS faculty are evaluated. Volume-based metrics alone are insufficient. Evaluations should consider:

1.The stage of career development (early-career faculty should not be judged solely on citation counts).

2.The institutional context (faculty in different institution types face different expectations and resources).

3.The quality as well as quantity of publications.

4.The limitations of database coverage.

14. RESULTS

14.1 Publication Productivity by Rank

Rank	Publication Pattern	Citation Impact
Assistant Professor	More conference papers; fewer journal articles	Lower citation counts
Associate Professor	Reversed pattern: more journal articles	Moderate citation counts
Full Professor	Significantly more publications overall	Significantly higher citation counts

Source: Shaw & Vaughan (2008)

14.2 Productivity by Institution Type

Institution Type	Publication Productivity
Doctoral-Granting Programs	Significantly higher
Non-Doctoral Programs	Significantly lower
Joint Doctoral Programs	Intermediate

Source: Shaw & Vaughan (2008)

14.3 Database Coverage Comparison

Database	Coverage for LIS	Notable Finding
Web of Science	Limited journal coverage	"No citations" for most LIS faculty publications
Scopus	Broader than WoS	Lower publication counts than GS for Indian faculty
Google Scholar	Widest coverage	Locates significantly more citations

Sources: Shaw & Vaughan (2008) ; Munshi et al. (2024)

14.4 Indian LIS Faculty Productivity

Metric	Finding
Average publications per faculty	4.54 (WoS data)
Top contributor	Bhaskar Mukherjee (44 publications, 23.03%)
Second contributor	Mohammad Nazim (28 publications, 14.65%)

Metric	Finding
Third contributor	M. Madhusudhan (13 publications, 6.8%)
Top 3 authors' share	44.5% of total publications

Source: LIS Faculty Study, Central Universities

14.5 Highly Productive Indian LIS Scholars

Scholar	Publications	Years Active	Annual Productivity
Prof. Manoj Kumar Verma	331	16	20.68/year
Prof. Thanuskodi S	-	-	180.2 annual citations (2,703 total)

Source: Giri & Chakravarty (2025)

14.6 Citation Patterns in Doctoral Theses

Metric	Finding
Average age of cited materials	32 years
Average references per thesis	132.18
Total references analyzed	18,638

Source: Singh, Kumar & Singh (2026)

14.7 Authorship Patterns

Authorship Type	Percentage
Single Author	30.18%
Two Authors	34.43%
Three Authors	19.81%
More than Five Authors	1.88%

Source: Bibliometric Study of West Zone LIS Faculty

14.8 Preferred Publication Formats

Format	Percentage of Citations
Journals	54.46%
Web Resources	22.96%
Books	14.11%

Format	Percentage of Citations
Theses/Dissertations	Marginal

Source: Bibliometric Study of West Zone LIS Faculty

15. CONCLUSION

15.1 Summary of Findings

This research has provided a comprehensive examination of citation patterns and research productivity among Library and Information Science faculty, with particular emphasis on the Indian academic context. The analysis of multiple empirical studies reveals consistent patterns:

Productivity and Rank: Publication output increases steadily with academic rank, with full professors demonstrating significantly higher productivity than assistant and associate professors. The type of publication also varies by rank, with assistant professors producing more conference papers and faculty at higher ranks producing more journal articles.

Citation Impact: Citation impact is significantly associated with academic rank, with full professors' works cited more frequently. However, this may reflect the longer time available to accumulate citations rather than intrinsic quality differences.

Institutional Context: Faculty at doctoral-granting institutions publish significantly more than those at institutions without doctoral programs, reflecting differences in research expectations, resources, and collaborative opportunities.

Asymmetry and Inequality: Research productivity is asymmetrically distributed, with a small number of highly productive authors accounting for a disproportionate share of publications and citations. This concentration is pronounced in many institutions, with aggregate performance metrics obscuring intra-institutional inequality.

Volume vs. Quality: Higher publication volume does not necessarily predict higher quality output. Some high-volume departments do not publish in higher-quartile journals, suggesting that volume-based evaluation systems are inadequate.

Database Choice: The choice of citation database significantly affects the visibility of LIS research. Google Scholar provides broader coverage than Web of Science and Scopus, revealing citations that are invisible in the other databases.

Collaboration Dynamics: Collaboration improves publication quality, quantity, and citation impact. International collaboration has a particularly significant positive effect. However, collaboration in LIS, particularly in India, remains relatively low.

15.2 Hypothesis Testing

H0 (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant relationship between academic rank and research productivity or citation impact.

Verdict: Rejected. There is a significant positive relationship between academic rank and both productivity and citation impact.

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between academic rank and research productivity and citation impact.

Verdict: Accepted. Full professors demonstrate significantly higher productivity and citation impact than faculty at other ranks.

H2: Citation patterns and research productivity among LIS faculty show significant asymmetry.

Verdict: Accepted. Productivity and citations are highly concentrated among a small number of faculty.

H3: Google Scholar provides significantly broader citation coverage for LIS faculty than Web of Science and Scopus.

Verdict: Accepted. Google Scholar reveals citations that are invisible in Web of Science and Scopus.

15.3 Implications

The findings have significant implications for LIS education, research policy, and academic evaluation. The identified asymmetry in research productivity suggests that evaluation systems should be inequality-sensitive, accounting for concentration patterns rather than relying solely

on aggregate measures. The volume-quality trade-off highlights the need for quality-oriented evaluation frameworks. The importance of collaboration, particularly international collaboration, suggests that institutions should invest in collaborative research infrastructure. The database coverage differences underscore the need for multi-database assessment.

15.4 Contribution to the Field

This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on LIS research productivity by synthesizing findings from multiple empirical studies and providing a comprehensive framework for understanding citation and publication patterns. It highlights both the strengths and limitations of existing research assessment practices and provides recommendations for improvement.

16. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

16.1 For LIS Departments and Institutions

Adopt Multi-Database Assessment: Institutions should use multiple citation databases, including Google Scholar, Web of Science, and Scopus, to assess research impact. Reliance on a single database may undercount citations and disadvantage researchers with different publication patterns .

Integrate Inequality-Sensitive Metrics: Institutions should move beyond aggregate measures to incorporate inequality-sensitive indicators, such as the Gini coefficient and Lorenz curves, in research assessment. This will provide a more realistic picture of institutional research performance .

Develop Quality-Oriented Evaluation: Volume-based metrics are insufficient. Evaluation frameworks should incorporate quality indicators, including publication in high-ranking journals, and should not assume that higher publication volume predicts higher quality .

Promote Collaboration: Institutions should encourage national and international collaboration, particularly for early-career researchers. Evidence shows that collaboration significantly improves publication quality and citation impact .

Enhance Doctoral Research Training: Supervisors and LIS departments should use research findings to guide doctoral research methodologies, encouraging engagement with contemporary research and innovative concepts .

Support Early-Career Researchers: Early-career faculty should not be penalized for lower citation counts, which may reflect shorter time to accumulate citations. Evaluation frameworks should be career-stage-sensitive .

16.2 For Researchers

Leverage Google Scholar: Researchers should ensure their Google Scholar profiles are current and complete, as GS provides the broadest citation coverage for LIS research .

Build Collaborative Networks: Researchers should invest in building national and international collaborative networks, as collaboration significantly improves publication and citation impact .

Balance Conference and Journal Publications: Early-career researchers should balance conference papers (which help build networks) with journal articles (which tend to receive more citations over time) .

Engage with Contemporary Research: Doctoral students and early-career researchers should be encouraged to engage with contemporary research and innovative concepts, rather than relying solely on established ideas .

Consider Publication Format: Journals and web resources are the most cited formats. Researchers should prioritize these venues to maximize impact .

16.3 For Policymakers

Reform Evaluation Systems: Research evaluation systems should be reformed to incorporate quality-oriented and inequality-sensitive indicators, moving beyond volume-based metrics .

Increase Research Investment: Investment in LIS research infrastructure should be increased, with a particular focus on resources for collaborative research .

Support Database Access: Institutions should provide access to multiple citation databases

and support researchers in managing their scholarly profiles and understanding their research impact .

Promote Interdisciplinary Research: Interdisciplinary research should be encouraged and supported, as it can enhance the visibility and impact of LIS research beyond the discipline ..

17. FUTURE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

17.1 Emerging Research Areas

Longitudinal Analysis: Future research should conduct longitudinal analyses to track how publication and citation patterns evolve over time for the same cohort of researchers. This would provide insight into career trajectories and the development of research productivity .

International Comparative Studies: Comparative studies across countries and regions would provide insight into how different research environments affect productivity and citation patterns .

Collaboration Dynamics: Further research is needed on the dynamics of collaboration in LIS, including the factors that facilitate or impede collaboration and the relationship between collaboration and specific types of research impact .

Gender Analysis: Studies on gender and citation patterns in LIS, though limited, suggest potential differences. Future research should systematically examine gender as a factor in research productivity and citation impact .

Altmetrics: The integration of altmetrics (social media mentions, downloads, shares) with traditional citation analysis is an emerging trend. Future research should examine how altmetrics complement citation-based measures of impact.

Self-Citation Analysis: Examination of self-citation patterns in LIS would provide insight into citation behavior and the potential for metric gaming .

17.2 Opportunities for Policy and Practice

Research Training Models: Findings on citation patterns should be used to develop evidence-based research training models. LIS departments should incorporate citation analysis into doctoral training to build students' understanding of scholarly communication and impact .

Mentorship Programs: Evidence on the factors that contribute to research productivity can inform mentorship programs, particularly for early-career researchers and doctoral students .

Institutional Benchmarking: Institutions can use the findings to benchmark their research performance against national and international peers .

17.3 Technological Advancements

AI-Assisted Bibliometric Analysis: The use of AI and machine learning for bibliometric analysis is likely to grow. Future research should explore the potential of these tools for analyzing citation patterns .

Open Science and Data Sharing: The Open Science movement and data sharing practices may affect citation patterns. Future research should examine how these practices influence the visibility and impact of LIS research.

References

1. Shaw, D., & Vaughan, L. (2008). Publication and citation patterns among LIS faculty: Profiling a "typical professor." Library & Information Science Research, 30(1), 47-55.
2. Singson, M., Karunakaran, K., & Sampath, T. (2026). Asymmetry of academic output: Evaluating research distribution and collaboration in LIS faculties. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science.
3. Giri, S., & Chakravarty, R. (2025). Measuring the Online Presence and Research Visibility of Indian Library and Information Science Educators: Insights Analysis Based on Google Scholar. DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, 45(4), 286-296.
4. Singh, A. K., Kumar, V., & Singh, V. (2026). Citation of classical research by doctoral-level LIS scholars in Indian universities: A study. Journal of Information Science.
5. Shaw, D., & Vaughan, L. (2008). Publication and citation patterns among LIS faculty: Profiling a "typical professor." Library & Information Science Research, 30(1), 47-55.
6. Maurya, S. K., Shukla, A., & Ngurtinkhuma, R. K. (2024). Exploring Research performance of Library and Information Science Faculties in Google Scholar: A Scientometric

Assessment. Indian Library Association Journal, 60(4).
7. Research Productivity of Library and Information Science Faculty of West Zone of India: A Bibliometric Study. (2022). Library Philosophy and Practice.
8. Munshi, S. A., Barsha, S., Pal, A., & Faizan, M. (2024). Exploring online presence: a study of Google Scholar and Scopus for assessing the visibility of LIS faculties in central universities of India. Information Discovery and Delivery.
9. Maurya, S. K. (2019). Research Performance of Library and Information Science Faculty of Central Universities of India: A Scientometric Study. Mizoram University.
10. Bibliometric Approach to Research Assessment: Publication Count, Citation Count, & Author Rank. Korean Citation Index.
11. Adkins, D., & Budd, J. (2006). Scholarly productivity of US LIS faculty. Library & Information Science Research, 28(3), 374–389.
12. Aguillo, I. F. (2012). Is Google Scholar useful for bibliometrics? A webometric analysis. Scientometrics, 91(2), 343–351.
13. Aksnes, D. W. (2003). Characteristics of highly cited papers. Research Evaluation, 12(3), 159-170.
14. Bauer, J., Leydesdorff, L., & Bornmann, L. (2016). Highly cited papers in Library and Information Science (LIS): Authors, institutions, and network structures. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 67(12), 3095–3100.
15. Bornmann, L., Haunschild, R., & Hug, S. E. (2018). Visualizing the context of citations referencing papers published by Eugene Garfield: A new type of keyword co-occurrence analysis. Scientometrics, 114(2), 427–437.
16. 16.Das, J. M., & Deka, D. (2023). Citation analysis of library and information science doctoral theses submitted to north-eastern hill university, Meghalaya. Journal of the Indian Library Association, 59(4), 24–39.
17. Garg, K. C., & Sharma, C. (2017). Bibliometric of library and information science research in India during 2004-2015. DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, 37(3), 221–227.
18. Gupta, S., & Gul, S. (2024). Tracking the research trends in the library and information science: A case study of India. Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication, 73(1-2), 202–218.
19. Hoffmann, K., Berg, S. A., & Koufogiannakis, D. (2015). Examining success: Identifying factors that contribute to research productivity across librarianship and other disciplines. Library and Information Research, 38(119), 13–28.
20. Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Maniadis, Z. (2024). Quantitative research assessment: Using metrics against gamed metrics. Internal and Emergency Medicine, 19(1), 39–47.
21. Keat, Y. C., & Kaur, K. (2008). Citation study of library and information science dissertations for collection development. Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science, 13(2), 29–47.
22. Patra, S. K. (2014). Google scholar-based citation analysis of Indian library and information science journals. Annals of Library and Information Studies, 61, 227–234.
23. Walters, W. H. (2016). The faculty subculture, the librarian subculture, and librarians' scholarly productivity. Portal, 16(3), 567-588.
24. Walters, W. H., & Wilder, E. I. (2016). Disciplinary, national, and departmental contributions to the literature of library and information science, 2007-2012. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology, 67(10), 2486-2501.
25. Xiao, X., Zhang, F., & Li, J. (2015). Library and Information Science Research in China-A Survey Based Analysis of 10 LIS Educational Institutes. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 41(4), 456-465.