

Annexure

Annexure for Chapter 2

Annex Table 2.1 *List of Key Informants*

| Organization | Key Informant Interviews (KII) |
|--|--|
| University of Dhaka (DU) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor, Department of Economics • Assistant Professor, Department of Economics • Associate Professor, Department of Economics • Associate Professor, Department of Political sciences • Associate Professor, Department of Sociology • Assistant Professor, Department of Development Studies • Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology • Director, Bangladesh Economic Research Centre (BERC) • Professor, Development Studies |
| Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director • Professor, Department of Philosophy • Adjunct Faculty, Department of Political Sciences • Assistant Secretary (All Academic Section & Computer Related Work) |
| Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director General • Senior Research Fellow (Male) • Senior Research Fellow (Female) • Finance Officer |
| Centre for Policy dialogue (CPD) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director • Research Fellow (Former) |
| Research and Evaluation Division (RED) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Director • Coordinator, Data Management • Coordinator, Socio-economic Development Unit |
| Bangladesh Council for Social Science Research (BCSSR) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former Director • Member, Advisory Committee |
| Planning Commission | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Director |
| University Grants Commission (UGC)* | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned Official, documentation Cell |
| Research Initiative Bangladesh (RIB) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Director |
| Key Person | Chairman, Committee for National Education Policy, 2010 |
| Private Large Research Firm** | Coordinator, Socio-economic Studies |
| Small Research Firm | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing Director |

* Attempts made to have KII with the Chairman of UGC but finally was not succeeded due to his time constraint

** The firm requested not to mention its name

Annex Table 2.2 *List of Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)*

| Institution | Number of FGD | Number of Participants | Participants | Remarks |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| DU* | 2 | 11 [6 + 5] | Associate Professors and Assistant Professors | In each FGD, both Associate Professors and Assistant Professors remained present |
| IBS | 2 | 12 [6 + 6] | PhD Scholars and MPhil Scholars | The plan for conducting an FGD with the Faculties could not be succeeded as they did not agree a time convenient for them; information was collected from them through KII and SSI. |
| BIDS | 1 | 4 | Senior Research Fellows | Due to some other engagements, other researchers could not join but it was a very well participated session. |
| CPD | 0 | 0 | Not applicable | The higher management did not allow the team to conduct any FGD. |
| RED | 1 | 8 | Researchers, Research Associates | Degree of participation of the discussants was very well. |

* Attempts made to have FGD sessions with the research scholars in DU but as the scholars carry on their work under non-residential arrangements and also at the time of fieldwork there was summer vacation in the university, so the study team finally could not bring them together in one place for the FGD session.

Annex Table 2.3 *List of Concerned Respondents for SSI**

| Organization | Respondents for SSI [Number] |
|--|---|
| University of Dhaka (DU) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor [2] • Associate Professor [4] • Assistant Professor [3] • Concerned Official, Administration [2] • MPhil Scholars [3] • PhD Scholars [2] |
| Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculties [2] • PhD Scholars [4] • MPhil Scholars [3] • Adjunct Faculties [2] |
| Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Associates [3] |
| Centre for Policy dialogue (CPD) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Fellow (Former) [2] |
| Research and Evaluation Division (RED) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Associates [3] |
| University Grants Commission (UGC)* | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned Official [1] |

* Semi structured Interviews

Annex Table 2.4 *Outline of the data collection instruments*

| | |
|---|--|
| A. Questionnaire for Research Students | <p>This questionnaire begins with a brief note of introduction and the respondents are assured of confidentiality of their identities and basically it is divided into five parts or sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) The first section consists of questions on identification details – age, gender etcetera and disciplinary and institutional background.ii) The second section seeks to capture the process of training and capability formation, development of critical thinking and understanding of nuances of research by students. The role of post-graduation in research training, course-works of M.Phil and PhD programmes; selection of research topics, methodology, research agenda, and allocation of supervisors are some of the crucial issues involved with research training.iii) The third section seeks to capture the availability of academic and physical infrastructure and financial assistance/grants. The section tries to elicit awareness and perceptions of students related to these elements of research environment.iv) The fourth section covers the awareness, perception and aspirations of students on dissemination of research. The section also tries to probe into the understanding of research quality.v) The fifth section is on socio-economic background of students. This last section seeks to bring out the factors influencing the motivation to pursue research by students. |
|---|--|

Annex Table 2.4 *Outline of the data collection instruments (Contd.)*

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>B. Questionnaire for Researchers</p> | <p>This questionnaire also begins with a brief note of introduction and the respondents are assured of confidentiality of their identities. The Questionnaire is divided into seven parts or sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The first section consists of questions on identification details – age, gender etcetera and disciplinary and institutional background. ii) The second section seeks to capture the process of training and capability formation. The role of research training ranging from university education to workshops; efforts to upgrade skills by the researchers and institutional support are some of the crucial issues involved with training and capability. iii) The third section seeks to capture the availability of academic and physical infrastructure and financial assistance/grants. The section tries to elicit awareness and perceptions of researchers related to these elements of research environment. iv) The fourth section covers the experiences with sponsored research projects and perceptions on different related aspects. A major portion of research carried out by professional researchers is constituted by sponsored research projects. v) The fifth section covers the awareness, perception and aspirations of researchers on dissemination of research. The section also tries to probe into the understanding of research quality. vi) The sixth section seeks to capture aspects and factors related to research collaborations through experiences and perceptions of researchers. vii) The seventh section tries to focus on the peculiarities of the profession of researchers. |
| <p>C. Questionnaire for Teaching Faculty</p> | <p>This questionnaire is similar in nature as the questionnaire for researchers. The first six sections of this questionnaire and a good number of questions are identical with the one discussed above. But the questions are modified according to the working conditions prevalent in universities. The seventh section tries to capture the experiences of teaching and doing research together.</p> |
| <p>D. Checklist for Key Informant Interview (KII)</p> | <p>The checklist for KII consists of questions aimed at the organizations. These questions seek to locate the organizations in the macro policy environment. The issues covered are- workforce, competition, collaboration, funding, regulatory regimes, services or products and related issues.</p> |

Annexure for Chapter 3

Annex Table 3.1: Government Expenditures on Education per Student in Five South Asian Countries during 2007 – 2013

| Government expenditure per student (in PPP\$) | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| For Primary Education | | | | | | | |
| <i>Bangladesh</i> | 169.2 | 173.2 | 168.8 | - | - | - | - |
| <i>India</i> | - | - | 272.5 | 290.9 | 401.4 | 432.7 | - |
| <i>Nepal</i> | - | 233.6 | 288.9 | - | - | - | - |
| <i>Pakistan</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <i>Sri Lanka</i> | - | - | 503.6 | - | - | - | - |
| For Secondary Education | | | | | | | |
| <i>Bangladesh</i> | 233 | 241.4 | 230.1 | 293.3 | 292.3 | | |
| <i>India</i> | - | - | 488 | 548.6 | 691.8 | 725.4 | - |
| <i>Nepal</i> | - | 173.5 | 218 | - | - | - | - |
| <i>Pakistan</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | 459.2 |
| <i>Sri Lanka</i> | - | - | - | 635 | 675.2 | 619.3 | - |
| For Tertiary Education | | | | | | | |
| <i>Bangladesh</i> | 597.5 | 627 | 532.7 | - | 420.1 | - | - |
| <i>India</i> | - | - | 2784.2 | 2778.4 | 2595.1 | 2626.9 | - |
| <i>Nepal</i> | - | 781.6 | 906.7 | 660.8 | - | - | - |
| <i>Pakistan</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3319.1 |
| <i>Sri Lanka</i> | - | - | - | 1891.3 | 2475.8 | 2180.3 | - |

Source: UNESCO Database (*UNESCO website*) (compiled by Author)

Annexure for Chapter 4

Annex 4.1

Case Study: Research Initiative Bangladesh (RIB)

The key distinguishing feature of RIB's research approach lays mostly on the peoples' participation in research processes. While, many are researcher-based, RIB encourages *bare-foot researcher* of marginalized and minority groups' people and thus induces and supports them to identify their problems and find solutions themselves. The organization realizes that an isolated and externally imposed research approach which ignores the holistic aspects of the peoples' life and exclude people to participate in the research activities; from problem identification through research processes and finding solutions is a shabby old way of doing research. It pointed out that lack of peoples' participation in research activities, imposition of donor goals and priorities, predetermined resources modalities, lack of local resources mobilization and ownership, and continuing donor funds and expertise dependency often lead to the withering away of the projects soon after the departure of external partners of their resources. Indeed, RIB believes that such research has little contribution to, and is an unsustainable way of finding the strategy of poverty alleviation.

However, to find the sustainable strategy of poverty alleviation and to accelerate development sustainably this organization has been employing a relatively holistic approach of research named participatory action research. In this approach, according to its statement RIB strives to involve participatory processes from the very design and conception of the research proposal, through the implementation phase of its final presentation, validation and follow up by the researchers and/or community being researched. It disburses fund to infamous and minority groups' general people and conducts trainings to develop their research skills.

To show the use of technology and advanced farming to marginalized farmers, it also do people to people exchange visit in different countries like India, Nepal. Doing so helps marginalized farmers to acquaint with the use of advanced technologies, and thus to increase their productivity.

It publishes the research findings on local publication rather on international ones. RIB believes local publications have great influence to raise awareness among respective communities and policy makers.

RIB organizes national and international seminar, workshop, dialogue, and meeting to present its research findings and perceptions. Its board members often participate in government organized events and thus it influences to policy formation. RIB's chairman is involved into the right to information policy formation phase.

RIB has a good research team. Many of the marginalized and minority groups' people are included in RIB's research team. As its main donor Government of Netherland did not dictate, it had freedom to choose research projects, research design, and methodology. As the contract period with Dutch Government has been ended, currently it has limited scope to conduct its own research as fund crisis raised; rather it is doing commission research.

Source: *Organizational Report and KII*

Annex Table 4.1 *Goals/Objectives for Public Academia*

| DU | IBS |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create new areas of knowledge and disseminate this knowledge to the society through its students | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Promote and provide facilities for advanced studies and research that are significantly related to the life and society of Bangladesh leading to the MPhil and PhD degrees• Undertake research projects in cooperation with public or private organizations as and when necessary under mutual agreements• Place at the disposal of society the results of the researches conducted at the Institute for fruitful utilization in planning and development schemes• Cooperate with other departments of the University of Rajshahi in research activities relevant to Bangladesh studies• Popularize Bangladesh Studies in and outside the country through seminars, conferences and publications• Perform such other functions as will facilitate attainment of the objectives of the Institute |

Source: *Organizational Website and Annual Report*

Annex Table 4.2 Goals/Objectives for Think Tanks (Public and Private) and NGO Research Division

| BIDS | CPD | RED |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote excellence in policy research and extend the knowledge frontiers to facilitate learning in development solutions especially in priority areas of development related to social well being of the poor and disadvantaged groups in society; • Collect and generate socioeconomic data to facilitate the conduct of analytical research on current economic and social issues and facilitate development planning and policy formulation by the government; • Disseminate knowledge and research based policy options to the policy makers and assist them in designing credible development strategies for achieving economic and social goals; • Expand outreach of research to civil society and other stakeholders to help shape policy debates on key development issues, develop broader understanding and consensus, and promote knowledge based policy agenda; • Conduct training and capacity building programs and promote the application of cutting edge research techniques and appropriate methodologies in economics and allied social sciences to develop human and institutional capacities within the government and in other institutions; • Promote research communication and networking to share research findings on the BIDS knowledge base and stimulate interaction within the research community, policy makers, civil society, and other stakeholders through organizing workshops, seminars, conferences, and using different modes of print and electronic media. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a platform for public discussion of important national policy issues with a view to building up a broad-based support for such policies. • Organize regular policy dialogues with participation from major stakeholders and stimulate a culture of dialogue and discussion on various important development issues • Conduct in-depth research on critical development issues, which could service the needs of an informed public debate • Raise policy awareness of young people in Bangladesh by conducting internship programme by creating opportunities to share their views, and by organizing policy appreciation courses for them. • Provide policy inputs to the principal decision-makers on the basis of research and dialogue outputs. • Enhance and stimulate endogenous capacity to design and implement domestic policy agendas with a view to generate a sense of ownership by encouraging research activities through grants and fellowships. • Disseminate the revealed wisdom stemming from the dialogue discussion to a broad spectrum of civil society through active dissemination and networking activities. • Undertake in depth case studies in order to generate first hand information on state of governance in particular sectors of the economy and bring the results of such investigation to public notice and subject these to public scrutiny and accountability. • Generate information on public perception on issues of national, economic and social interest and on state of governance by conducting periodical public perception polls. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to the development of new interventions • Provide evidence-based support to BRAC programmes • Document best practices (lessons learned) |

Source: *Organizational Website and Annual Report*

Annex Table 4.3 Broad Research Areas for Public Academia

| DU | IBS |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different issues of Social Sciences | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploration of the country's heritage as well as development of its economy • Advanced studies and research on the history, geography, economics, politics, sociology, anthropology, law, language, literature and linguistics, philosophy, art, archeology, music, and culture of Bangladesh |

Source: *Organizational Website and Annual Report*

Annex Table 4.4 Broad Research Areas for Think Tanks (Public and Private) and NGO Research Division

| BIDS | CPD | RED |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture and Rural Development • General Economics • Human Resources Development • Industry and Physical Infrastructure • Population Studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macroeconomic performance analysis; • Resource Mobilization and Fiscal Policies • Poverty, Inequality and Social Justice • Agriculture and Rural Development • Trade, Regional Cooperation and Global Integration • Investment Promotion, Infrastructure and Enterprise Development • Climate Change and Environment • Human Development and Social Protection • Development Governance, Policies and Institutions | <p>Manly programme driven research in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture • applied and reproductive health • education • environment • extreme poverty • food security and nutrition • microfinance • social development • human rights |

Source: *Organizational Website, Annual Report and SSI*

Annexure 5

Annex Table 5.1: *Distribution of Sample Respondents*

| Type of respondents | Number of respondents | Percent |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Faculty | 32 | 36.4 |
| Researcher | 22 | 25.0 |
| Research Scholar | 34 | 38.6 |
| TOTAL | 88 | 100.0 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.2: *Background Information of the Sample Respondents*

| Indicator | Value | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| <i>City (%)</i> | | | |
| Dhaka | 59.4 (19) | 95.5 (21) | 44.1 (15) |
| Rajshahi | 40.6 (13) | 4.5 (1) | 55.9 (19) |
| <i>Gender (%)</i> | | | |
| Male | 84.4 (27) | 63.6 (14) | 79.4 (27) |
| Female | 15.6 (5) | 36.4 (8) | 20.6 (7) |
| <i>Age (years)</i> | | | |
| Mean Age | 42.4 | 37.9 | 33.1 |
| <i>Experience</i> | | | |
| <i>Mean Years of Experience</i> | 17.3 | 12.1 | 6.1 |
| <i>Religion (%)</i> | | | |
| Islam | 84.4 (27) | 86.4 (19) | 97.1 (33) |
| Hinduism | 9.4(3) | 9.1 (2) | 2.9 (1) |
| Other | 6.3 (2) | 4.5 (1) | 0.0 (0) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.3: *Percentage Distribution of the Sample Respondents by their Current Position*

| Type of Respondents | Current Position | Percent |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Faculty | Professor | 34.4 (11) |
| | Associate Professor | 43.8 (14) |
| | Assistant Professor | 21.9 (7) |
| | Lecturer | 0.0 (0) |
| | N | 32 |
| Researchers | Executive Director | 4.5 (1) |
| | Senior Researcher Fellow | 13.6 (3) |
| | Research Fellow | 27.3 (6) |
| | Senior research Associate | 13.6 (3) |
| | Researcher Associate | 31.8 (7) |
| | Researcher officer | 9.1 (2) |
| | N | 22 |
| Research Scholars | MPhil (Pursuing) | 23.0 (8) |
| | MPhil (Completed) | 35.8 (12) |
| | PhD (Pursuing) | 11.8 (4) |
| | PhD (Completed) | 41.2 (14) |
| | N | 34 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.4: *Percentage Distribution of the Sample Faculties and Researchers by their Subject/Discipline at PG*

| Type of respondents | Subject/Discipline at PG | Percent |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Faculty | Sociology | 21.9 (7) |
| | Economics | 31.3 (10) |
| | Social Welfare | 12.5 (4) |
| | Political Science | 9.4 (3) |
| | Development Studies | 6.3 (2) |
| | Mass Communication & Journalism | 3.1 (1) |
| | Anthropology | 6.3 (2) |
| | Islamic history & Culture | 3.1 (1) |
| | Urban & Regional - GIS | 3.1 (1) |
| | Environmental Ethics | 3.1 (1) |
| | N | 32 |
| Researcher | Economics | 45.5 (10) |
| | Sociology | 22.7 (5) |
| | Development Economic | 9.1 (2) |
| | Applied Statistic | 4.5 (1) |
| | Public Administration | 9.1 (2) |
| | Marketing | 4.5 (1) |
| | Anthropology | 4.5 (1) |
| | N | 22 |
| Research Scholar | Government & Politics | 5.9 (2) |
| | Anthropology | 17.6 (6) |
| | Economics | 14.7 (5) |
| | Sociology | 14.7 (5) |
| | Development Studies | 2.9 (1) |
| | Geriatrics welfare | 5.9 (2) |
| | Local Government | 2.9 (1) |
| | Disaster Management | 2.9 (1) |
| | Urban Governance | 2.9 (1) |
| | International Relations | 2.9 (1) |
| | Human Crisis During War Situation | 2.9 (1) |
| | Film & Society | 2.9 (1) |
| | Social Work | 5.9 (2) |
| | Gender Issues and Women Empowerment | 2.9 (1) |
| | Political Science | 5.9 (2) |
| | Geography & Land Suitability | 2.9 (1) |
| Governance & Development | 2.9 (1) | |
| N | 34 | |

Source: *Questionnaire Survey performed under this study*

Annex Table 5.5: *Academic Degree Achieved by the Respondents*

| Academic degree | Value (Percentage) | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| PhD | 87.5 (28) | 40.9 (9) | 11.8 (4) |
| MPhil | 25.0 (8) | 13.6 (3) | 23.5 (8) |
| Both | 21.9 (7) | 4.5 (1) | 2.9 (1) |
| Neither | 9.4 (3) | 50.0 (11) | 67.6 (23) |

Source: *Questionnaire Survey performed under this study*

Table 5.6: Average Duration for Degree Achievement

| Academic degree | Value (Years) | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|--------------------|-------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar | Total |
| PhD | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 2.6 |
| <i>n</i> | 8 | 3 | 8 | 11 |
| MPhil | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| <i>n</i> | 28 | 9 | 4 | 41 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.7: Abilities of the faculty members

| Purpose s | Academic Culture of University/ Institute last attended | | | | | | Supervisor/Mentor (M. Phil/PhD) | | | | | | On the job training | | | | | | Learning by doing | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Responses | | | | | | Responses | | | | | | Responses | | | | | | Responses | | | | | |
| | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer |
| Writing skill | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 15.6 (5) | 37.5 (12) | 18.8 (6) | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 6.3 (2) | 18.8 (6) | 25.0 (8) | 31.3 (10) | 12.5 (4) | 8.6 (3) | 14.3 (5) | 17.1 (6) | 22.9 (8) | 8.6 (3) | 20.0 (7) | 8.6 (3) | 5.7 (2) | 17.1 (6) | 20.0 (7) | 22.9 (8) | 17.1 (6) |
| Critical Understanding | 12.5 (4) | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 43.8 (14) | 18.8 (6) | 9.4 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 9.4 (3) | 15.6 (5) | 21.9 (7) | 40.6 (13) | 12.5 (4) | 8.6 (3) | 17.1 (6) | 8.6 (3) | 28.6 (10) | 5.7 (2) | 22.9 (8) | 8.6 (3) | 2.9 (1) | 11.4 (4) | 31.4 (11) | 14.3 (5) | 22.9 (8) |
| Research Methodology | 15.6 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 9.4 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 37.5 (12) | 12.5 (4) | 6.3 (2) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 28.1 (9) | 34.4 (11) | 12.5 (4) | 11.4 (4) | 11.4 (4) | 11.4 (4) | 22.9 (8) | 11.4 (4) | 22.9 (8) | 8.6 (3) | 8.6 (3) | 11.4 (4) | 14.3 (5) | 22.9 (8) | 25.7 (9) |
| Presentation skills | 9.4 (3) | 9.4 (3) | 18.8 (6) | 25.0 (8) | 25.0 (8) | 12.5 (4) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 15.6 (5) | 15.6 (5) | 25.0 (8) | 21.9 (7) | 8.6 (3) | 5.7 (2) | 8.6 (3) | 34.3 (12) | 11.4 (4) | 22.9 (8) | 5.7 (2) | 5.7 (2) | 17.1 (6) | 20.0 (0) | 17.1 (6) | 25.7 (9) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.8: Abilities of the researchers

| Purpose s | Academic Culture of University/ Institute last attended | | | | | | Supervisor/Mentor (M. Phil/PhD) | | | | | | On the job training | | | | | | Learning by doing | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Responses | | | | | | Responses | | | | | | Responses | | | | | | Responses | | | | | |
| | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | No answer |
| Writing skill | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 18.2 (4) | 27.3 (6) | 31.8 (7) | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 45.5 (10) | 31.8 (7) | 0.0 (0) | 18.2 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 50.0 (11) | 0.0 (0) | 18.2 (4) | 9.1 (2) | 22.7 (5) | 13.6 (3) | 36.4 (8) |
| Critical Understanding | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 27.3 (6) | 36.4 (8) | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 40.9 (9) | 31.8 (7) | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 45.5 (10) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 18.2 (4) | 36.4 (8) |
| Research Methodology | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 18.2 (4) | 27.3 (6) | 27.3 (6) | 13.6 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 40.9 (9) | 31.8 (7) | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 45.5 (10) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 22.7 (5) | 36.4 (8) |
| Presentation skills | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 27.3 (6) | 31.8 (7) | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 18.2 (4) | 31.8 (7) | 31.8 (7) | 0.0 (0) | 18.2 (4) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 45.5 (10) | 0.0 (0) | 22.7 (5) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 22.7 (5) | 36.4 (8) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.9: Awareness of research scholars

| Awareness issue | Responses | | | | | | Total | N |
|-------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|---|
| | Very poor | Poor | Moderate | Above average | Very much | | | |
| Research writing | 0.0 (0) | 11.8 (4) | 2.9 (1) | 32.4 (11) | 52.9 (18) | 100.0 | 34 | |
| Formulating Research proposal | 2.9 (1) | 8.8 (3) | 5.9 (2) | 32.4 (11) | 50.0 (17) | 100.0 | 34 | |
| Quantitative Techniques | 5.9 (2) | 20.6 (7) | 14.7 (5) | 41.2 (14) | 17.6 (6) | 100.0 | 34 | |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.10: Characteristics of universities in your country with the top universities of the world

| Characteristics | Responses | | | | | Total | N |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Very Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Very Good | | |
| Teaching-Learning | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 28.1 (9) | 21.9 (7) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 |
| Curriculum | 3.1 (1) | 18.8 (6) | 28.1 (9) | 25.0 (8) | 25.0 (8) | 100.0 | 32 |
| Research Methodology | 12.5 (4) | 31.3 (10) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 |
| Up to date Reading materials | 9.4 (3) | 28.1 (9) | 28.1 (9) | 21.9 (7) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 |
| Academic Culture | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 31.3 (10) | 9.4 (3) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 32 |
| Research Guidance | 25.0 (8) | 31.3 (10) | 18.8 (6) | 18.8 (6) | 6.3 (2) | 100.0 | 32 |
| Peer Group | 18.8 (6) | 28.1 (9) | 31.3 (10) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.11: *Classification of research Conducted (Multiple Responses)*

| Classification of Research | Value (Percentage) | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| Archive-based/Documentary | 34.4 (11) | 72.7 (15) | - |
| Theoretical | 40.6 (13) | 0.0 (0) | - |
| Experimental | 25.0 (8) | 36.4 (8) | - |
| Empirical | 81.3 (26) | 86.4 (19) | - |
| Case-Studies | 71.9 (23) | 77.3 (17) | - |
| Action Research | 0.0 (0) | 45.5 (10) | - |
| Other | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | - |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.12: *Tools Applied for Data Collection (Multiple Responses)*

| Classification of Research | Value (Percentage) | | |
|--|--------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| Observation | 53.1 (17) | 54.5 (12) | 55.9 (19) |
| Interview | 78.1 (25) | 81.8 (18) | 73.5 (25) |
| Archive/Document | 71.9 (23) | 50.0 (11) | 29.4 (10) |
| Focus Group Discussion | 78.1 (25) | 77.3 (17) | 44.1 (15) |
| Questionnaire/Schedule-Structured | 75.0 (24) | 77.3 (17) | 29.4 (10) |
| Questionnaire/Schedule-Semi Structured | 56.3 (18) | 68.2 (15) | 32.4 (11) |
| Checklist | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) |
| Other | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 2.9 (1) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.13: *Techniques Applied for Data Analysis (Multiple Responses)*

| Classification of Research | Value (Percentage) | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| Content Analysis | 59.4 (19) | 59.1 (13) | 70.6 (24) |
| Discourse Analysis | 40.6 (13) | 45.5 (10) | 32.4 (11) |
| Principal Component Analysis | 28.1 (9) | 45.5 (10) | 29.4 (10) |
| Regression Analysis | 56.3 (18) | 95.5 (21) | 32.4 (11) |
| Other | 40.6 (13) | 13.6 (3) | 14.7 (5) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.14: Influencing factors to choose research tools

| Influencing factors | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------|----|
| | Not at all | Low | Moderate | High | Great extent | Total | N | Not at all | Low | Moderate | High | Great extent | Total | N |
| Prevailing trend in the discipline/area of research | 0.0 (0) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 25.0 (8) | 40.6 (13) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 31.8 (7) | 45.5 (10) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Prior knowledge of research tools | 0.0 (0) | 6.3 (2) | 25.0 (8) | 21.9 (7) | 46.9 (15) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 31.8 (7) | 36.4 (8) | 31.8 (7) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Objectives and Research Questions | 0.0 (0) | 6.3 (2) | 12.5 (4) | 25.0 (8) | 56.3 (18) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1) | 27.3 (6) | 68.2 (15) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Desirability of Journal Editors | 18.8 (6) | 9.4 (3) | 21.9 (7) | 25.0 (8) | 25.0 (8) | 100.0 | 32 | 13.6 (3) | 22.7 (5) | 31.8 (7) | 22.7 (5) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.15: Efforts for research tools

| Efforts | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------|----|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------|----|
| | Never | Few times | Moderate | Often | Very often | Total | N | Never | Few times | Moderate | Often | Very often | Total | N |
| To upgrade knowledge of your discipline | 6.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 15.6 (5) | 28.1 (9) | 50.0 (16) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 40.9 (9) | 40.9 (9) | 100.0 | 22 |
| To learn from other Disciplines | 9.4 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 40.6 (13) | 28.1 (9) | 21.9 (7) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 59.1 (13) | 31.8 (7) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 22 |
| To upgrade knowledge of Research Methodology | 6.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 28.1 (9) | 21.9 (7) | 43.8 (14) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 40.9 (9) | 31.8 (7) | 100.0 | 22 |
| To upgrade research skills (techniques) | 6.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 15.6 (5) | 34.4 (11) | 43.8 (14) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 36.4 (8) | 18.2 (4) | 40.9 (9) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.16: Usefulness of programmes/courses

| Programmes/ courses | Faculty members | | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------------|-------|----|-------------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------------|-------|----|
| | Very Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Very Good | Did not attend | Total | N | Very Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Very Good | Did not attend | Total | N |
| Refresher Course(s) | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 28.1 (9) | 18.8 (6) | 15.6 (5) | 25.0 (8) | 100.0 | 32 | | | | | | | | |
| Orientation Programme(s) | 3.1 (1) | 12.5 (4) | 28.1 (9) | 12.5 (4) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 100.0 | 32 | | | | | | | | |
| Workshop(s) | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 34.4 (11) | 9.4 (3) | 100.0 | 32 | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 36.4 (8) | 22.7 (5) | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.17: Usefulness of the workshops in terms of your learning by research scholars

| Usefulness of workshops | Responses | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------------|-------|----|
| | Very good | Good | Moderate | Poor | Very poor | Did not attend | Total | N |
| Research writing | 14.7 (5) | 26.5 (9) | 5.9 (2) | 14.7 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 38.2 (13) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Formulating Research proposal | 14.7 (5) | 17.6 (6) | 11.8 (4) | 11.8 (4) | 2.9 (1) | 41.2 (14) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Quantitative Techniques | 17.6 (6) | 11.8 (4) | 17.6 (6) | 14.7 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 38.2 (13) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Qualitative Techniques | 11.8 (4) | 14.7 (5) | 23.5 (8) | 11.8 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 38.2 (13) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Software Training | 14.7 (5) | 11.8 (4) | 14.7 (5) | 8.8 (3) | 2.9 (1) | 47.1 (16) | 100.0 | 34 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.18: Factors of attending workshop by research scholars

| Factor | Responses | | | | | | Total | N |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|----------|------------|-------------|-------|----|
| | Not at all | Less often | Moderate | Often | Very often | No response | | |
| Distance to be travelled reduces your willingness to attend a workshop | 26.5 (9) | 14.7 (5) | 14.7 (5) | 11.8 (4) | 2.9 (1) | 29.4 (10) | 100.0 | 34 |
| The chances of selection for a workshop increases, if the organisers are acquaintance | 8.8 (3) | 8.8 (3) | 26.5 (9) | 17.6 (6) | 5.9 (2) | 32.4 (11) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Workshops sponsored by Professional Bodies (like ICSSR) are easy to attend financially | 14.7 (5) | 14.7 (5) | 20.6 (7) | 11.8 (4) | 8.8 (3) | 29.4 (10) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Workshops are valued by the quality of experts/resource persons | 5.9 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 29.4 (10) | 26.5 (9) | 8.8 (3) | 29.4 (10) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Workshops are attended to upgrade skills | 5.9 (2) | 17.6 (6) | 14.7 (5) | 23.5 (8) | 8.8 (3) | 29.4 (10) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Resource persons for workshops are generally invited from nearby institutions/universities | 5.9 (2) | 8.8 (3) | 26.5 (9) | 8.8 (3) | 20.6 (7) | 29.4 (10) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Attending workshops is required to accumulate points for teaching jobs | 20.6 (7) | 8.8 (3) | 23.5 (8) | 11.8 (4) | 5.9 (2) | 29.4 (10) | 100.0 | 34 |
| International workshops are generally better in terms of usefulness (learning) | 0.0 (0) | 14.7 (5) | 17.6 (6) | 17.6 (6) | 20.6 (7) | 29.4 (10) | 100.0 | 34 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.19: Rankings of aspects related to seminars and conferences by research scholars

| Platform | Responses (reported ranks) | | | | Total | Total rank score | N |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|------------------|----|
| | First | Second | Third | Last | | | |
| Platform to disseminate research | 22.6 (7) | 41.9 (13) | 25.8 (8) | 9.7 (3) | 100.0 | 86 | 31 |
| Platform to learn from others | 54.8 (17) | 16.1 (5) | 25.8 (8) | 3.2 (1) | 100.0 | 100 | 31 |
| Platform to gather feedback | 19.4 (6) | 25.8 (8) | 35.5 (11) | 19.4 (6) | 100.0 | 77 | 31 |
| Platform to socialize | 3.2 (1) | 12.9 (4) | 16.1 (5) | 67.7 (21) | 100.0 | 47 | 31 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.20: Ranking of important aspects of research training

| Aspects of research | Faculty members | | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------|-------|----|----|
| | First | Second | Third | Fourth | Fifth | Last | Total | Total rank score | N | First | Second | Third | Fourth | Fifth | Last | Total | Total rank score | N | | |
| Writing Skills | 31.3 (10) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 128 | 32 | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 31.8 (7) | 9.1 (2) | 36.4 (8) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 78 | 22 |
| Presentation Skills | 12.5 (4) | 18.8 (6) | 15.6 (5) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 108 | 32 | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 40.9 (9) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 62 | 22 | 22 |
| English Language | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 18.8 (6) | 6.3 (2) | 100.0 | 119 | 32 | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 4.5 (1) | 31.8 (7) | 22.7 (5) | 22.7 (5) | 100.0 | 62 | 22 | 22 | |
| Methodology | 31.3 (10) | 15.6 (5) | 15.6 (5) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 3.1 (1) | 100.0 | 133 | 32 | 31.8 (7) | 31.8 (7) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 18.2 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 | 99 | 22 | 22 | |
| Tools and techniques | 12.5 (4) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 9.4 (3) | 28.1 (9) | 6.3 (2) | 100.0 | 116 | 32 | 18.2 (4) | 27.3 (6) | 18.2 (4) | 9.1 (2) | 27.3 (6) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 | 88 | 22 | 22 | |
| Computer and Software(s) | 9.4 (3) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 25.0 (8) | 25.0 (8) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 95 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 27.3 (6) | 13.6 (3) | 36.4 (8) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 63 | 22 | 22 | |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.21: Research training taught at the PG level

| Aspects of research | Faculty members | | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------|----|-------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------|-------|----|
| | Not at all | Low | Moderate | High | Great extent | No response | Total | N | Not at all | Low | Moderate | High | Great extent | No response | Total | N |
| Writing Skills | 12.5 (4) | 15.6 (5) | 28.1 (9) | 25.0 (8) | 18.8 (6) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 31.8 (7) | 27.3 (6) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Presentation Skills | 12.5 (4) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 18.8 (6) | 28.1 (9) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 22.7 (5) | 40.9 (9) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Computer and Software(s) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 18.8 (6) | 25.0 (8) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 27.3 (6) | 27.3 (6) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Methodology | 0.0 (0) | 12.5 (4) | 21.9 (7) | 40.6 (13) | 25.0 (8) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 54.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Tools and techniques | 0.0 (0) | 12.5 (4) | 15.6 (5) | 43.8 (14) | 28.1 (9) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 18.2 (4) | 31.8 (7) | 27.3 (6) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.22: Comfort level with English with respect to classmates by research scholars

| Comfort level with English | Responses | | | | | Total | N |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|------------------|-------|----|
| | Very uncomfortable | Above average uncomfortable | Moderate | Comfortable | Very comfortable | | |
| Classroom communication | 8.8 (3) | 14.7 (5) | 26.5 (9) | 26.5 (9) | 23.5 (8) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Literature-review | 0.0 (0) | 11.8 (4) | 26.5 (9) | 23.5 (8) | 38.2 (13) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Presentation | 2.9 (1) | 5.9 (2) | 26.5 (9) | 29.4 (10) | 35.3 (12) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Writing | 0.0 (0) | 5.9 (2) | 17.6 (6) | 35.3 (12) | 41.2 (14) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Interaction with Mentor/Supervisor | 5.9 (2) | 14.7 (5) | 26.5 (9) | 29.4 (10) | 23.5 (8) | 100.0 | 34 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.23: Relationship between research scholars and their mentors

| Relationship with mentor | Responses | | | | | Total | N |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Very poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Very good | | |
| Academic Help | 0.0 (0) | 2.9 (1) | 8.8 (3) | 26.5 (9) | 61.8 (21) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Personal Rapport | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 5.9 (2) | 44.1 (15) | 47.1 (16) | 100.0 | 34 |
| Professional Compatibility | 5.9 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 14.7 (5) | 35.3 (12) | 44.1 (15) | 100.0 | 34 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.24: Plagiarism

| Occurrences relevant to plagiarism | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|----|-------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | Total | N | Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High | Total | N |
| Efforts at your institution to create awareness for plagiarism | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 9.4 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 25.0 (8) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 40.9 (9) | 31.8 (7) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Occurrences of instances of plagiarism by students | 12.5 (4) | 25.0 (8) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 100.0 | 32 | 40.9 (9) | 31.8 (7) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.25: Characteristic of the current program (SCHOLARS, Multiple Responses)

| Characteristic | Percentage (n) |
|---|----------------|
| Latest research technique | 29.4 (10) |
| Quantitative methods | 61.8 (21) |
| Skills-software(s) | 26.5 (9) |
| Qualitative methods (FGD, observation etc.) | 82.4 (28) |
| Others | 5.9 (2) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.26: *support Received from Institutional Library (Multiple Responses)*

| Support from library | Percentage (n) | | |
|--|----------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| Reference sorting for your area of research | 53.1 (17) | 59.1 (13) | 79.4 (27) |
| Subscription to new Journals on request | 53.1 (17) | 45.5 (10) | 47.1 (16) |
| Purchasing new books on request | 87.5 (28) | 72.7 (16) | 35.3 (12) |
| Plagiarism-check | 46.9 (15) | 9.1 (2) | 17.6 (6) |
| Searching physical copies of Books/Journals in Library | 84.4 (27) | 90.9 (20) | 85.3 (29) |
| Subscription to Online Data-bases | 28.1 (9) | 50.0 (11) | 17.6 (6) |
| Access to E-resources (books/journals) | 68.8 (22) | 59.1 (13) | 61.8 (21) |
| Inter-library borrowing of books | - | - | 50.0 (17) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.27: *Extent of access to Internet (Multiple Responses)*

| Access to internet | Percentage (n) | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| Wi-Fi Campus | 50.0 (16) | 54.5 (1) | 50.0 (17) |
| Wi-Fi Accommodation/Residence | 43.8 (14) | 13.6 (3) | 35.3 (12) |
| Wi-Fi Department/Centre | 71.9 (23) | 50.0 (0) | 52.9 (18) |
| Local Area Network (LAN) | 68.8 (22) | 86.4 (19) | 0.0 (0) |
| Library | 59.4 (19) | 27.3 (6) | 44.1 (15) |
| Computer Centre | 56.3 (18) | 18.2 (4) | 38.2 (13) |
| Other | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.28: Extent of satisfaction of services by Questionnaire type

| Area of satisfaction | Value (Percentage) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Faculty | | | | | Researcher | | | | | Researcher Scholar | | | | |
| | Very low | Low | Neutral | High | Very High | Very low | Low | Neutral | High | Very High | Very low | Low | Neutral | High | Very High |
| Availability of books in the library | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 34.4 (11) | 21.9 (7) | 9.4 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 31.8 (7) | 36.4 (8) | 22.7 (5) | 3.0 (1) | 15.2 (5) | 15.2 (5) | 36.4 (12) | 30.3 (10) |
| Availability of subscribed of Journals | 12.5 (4) | 34.4 (11) | 31.3 (10) | 12.5 (4) | 9.4 (3) | 4.8 (1) | 14.3 (3) | 33.3 (7) | 28.6 (6) | 19.0 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 12.1 (4) | 27.3 (9) | 42.4 (14) | 18.2 (6) |
| Processing requests by Library | 21.9 (7) | 40.6 (13) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 4.8 (1) | 4.8 (1) | 38.1 (8) | 42.9 (9) | 9.5 (2) | 6.1 (2) | 12.1 (4) | 24.2 (8) | 36.4 (12) | 21.2 (7) |
| Availability of E-resources (books/ journals) | 18.8 (6) | 25.0 (8) | 25.0 (8) | 25.0 (8) | 6.3 (2) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 59.1 (13) | 6.1 (2) | 15.2 (5) | 15.2 (5) | 33.3 (11) | 30.3 (10) |
| Subscription to online databases | 18.8 (6) | 34.4 (11) | 31.3 (10) | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 27.3 (6) | 40.9 (9) | 12.5 (4) | 18.8 (6) | 34.4 (11) | 21.9 (7) | 12.5 (4) |
| Availability of Computers at institution | 9.4 (3) | 28.1 (9) | 12.5 (4) | 31.3 (10) | 18.8 (6) | 9.1 (2) | 4.5 (1) | 36.4 (8) | 40.9 (9) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (3) | 21.2 (7) | 51.5 (17) | 9.1 (3) | 9.1 (3) |
| ICT maintenance services | 21.9 (7) | 25.0 (8) | 31.3 (10) | 15.6 (5) | 6.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 36.4 (8) | 40.9 (9) | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (3) | 18.2 (6) | 48.5 (8) | 24.2 (16) |
| Internet services | 12.5 (4) | 15.6 (5) | 25.0 (8) | 21.9 (7) | 25.0 (8) | 5.3 (1) | 10.5 (2) | 15.8 (3) | 31.6 (6) | 36.8 (7) | | | | | |
| Work-space allotted at institution | 15.6 (5) | 21.9 (7) | 28.1 (9) | 18.8 (6) | 15.6 (5) | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.29: Financial assistance to faculty members

| Responses | Experience | | | | | | Adequacy | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Not Available | Never Applied | Applied but unsuccessful | Applied and waiting | Availed | Not Given Answer | Very poor | Poor | Moderate | Satisfactory | Very satisfactory | Not Given Answer |
| Purpose | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carrying out your own research/institutional project | 28.1 (9) | 15.6 (5) | 9.4 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 40.6 (13) | 6.3 (2) | 25.0 (8) | 18.8 (6) | 6.3 (2) | 9.4 (3) | 3.1 (1) | 37.5 (12) |
| Publication | 34.4 (11) | 21.9 (7) | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 21.9 (7) | 6.3 (2) | 12.5 (4) | 6.3 (2) | 3.1 (1) | 50.0 (16) |
| Carrying out Field work for your own Research | 37.5 (12) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 12.5 (4) | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 62.5 (20) |
| Travel grant to attend Seminars/Conferences | 25.0 (8) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 37.5 (12) | 18.8 (6) | 31.3 (10) | 12.5 (4) | 6.3 (2) | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 43.8 (14) |
| Organising Academic events | 15.6 (5) | 15.6 (5) | 9.4 (3) | 3.1 (1) | 31.3 (10) | 25.0 (8) | 15.6 (5) | 12.5 (4) | 6.3 (2) | 12.5 (4) | 9.4 (3) | 43.8 (14) |
| Grants for Library visit | 37.5 (12) | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 3.1 (1) | 6.3 (2) | 40.6 (13) | 28.1 (9) | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 56.3 (18) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.30: Financial assistance to researchers

| Responses | Experience | | | | | | Adequacy | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Not Available | Never Applied | Applied but unsuccessful | Applied and waiting | Availed | Not Given Answer | Very poor | Poor | Moderate | Satisfactory | Very satisfactory | Not Given Answer |
| Purpose | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carrying out your own research/institutional project | 4.5 (1) | 31.8 (7) | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 54.5 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 40.9 (9) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 22.7 (5) | 13.6 (3) |
| Publication | 18.2 (4) | 27.3 (6) | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 40.9 (9) | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 27.3 (6) | 18.2 (4) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 27.3 (6) |
| Carrying out Field work for your own Research | 13.6 (3) | 31.8 (7) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 31.8 (7) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 22.7 (5) | 31.8 (7) |
| Attending Seminars/Conferences | 13.6 (3) | 22.7 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 59.1 (13) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 22.7 (5) | 18.2 (4) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 22.7 (5) |
| Organising Academic events | 22.7 (5) | 22.7 (5) | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 40.9 (9) | 4.5 (1) | 22.7 (5) | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 27.3 (6) |
| Library visit | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 4.5 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 31.8 (7) | 50.0 (11) | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 54.5 (1) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.31: Financial assistance to research scholars

| Responses | Experience | | | | | | Adequacy | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Not Available | Never Applied | Applied but unsuccessful | Applied and waiting | Availed | Not Given Answer | Very poor | Poor | Moderate | Satisfactory | Very satisfactory | Not Given Answer |
| Purpose | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Carrying out your research (M. Phil/PhD) | 8.8 (3) | 26.5 (9) | 0.0 (0) | 14.7 (5) | 41.2 (14) | 8.8 (3) | 23.5 (8) | 17.6 (6) | 5.9 (2) | 8.8 (3) | 2.9 (1) | 41.2 (14) |
| Field work | 20.6 (7) | 32.4 (11) | 0.0 (0) | 2.9 (1) | 11.8 (4) | 32.4 (11) | 20.6 (7) | 5.9 (2) | 11.8 (4) | 5.9 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 52.9 (1) |
| Travel Grant | 26.5 (9) | 29.4 (10) | 0.0 (0) | 2.9 (1) | 5.9 (2) | 35.3 (12) | 14.7 (5) | 2.9 (1) | 11.8 (4) | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) | 64.7 (1) |
| Library visit | 23.5 (8) | 23.5 (8) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 8.8 (3) | 44.1 (15) | 29.4 (10) | 11.8 (4) | 5.9 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) | 47.1 (16) |
| Seminar/Conferences | 35.3 (12) | 29.4 (10) | 0.0 (0) | 5.9 (2) | 5.9 (2) | 23.5 (8) | 14.7 (5) | 11.8 (4) | 5.9 (2) | 11.8 (4) | 8.8 (3) | 47.1 (16) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.32: Source of Information Regarding Financial Assistance/Scholarships (Multiple Responses)

| Source of information | Value (Percentage) | | |
|--|--------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Faculty | Researcher | Researcher Scholar |
| Public Notices/Advertisements by Source/Agencies/Departments | 53.1 (17) | 63.6 (14) | - |
| Notices/Circulars to your Institution/Organisation | 37.5 (12) | 77.3 (17) | - |
| Peer Group | 34.4 (11) | 40.9 (9) | - |
| Websites of Source/Agencies/Departments | 59.4 (19) | 40.9 (9) | - |
| Other | 9.4 (3) | 9.1 (2) | - |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.33: Work-culture of university/institution

| Work-culture | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------|----|-------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Very Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Very Good | Total | N | Very Poor | Poor | Moderate | Good | Very Good | Total | N |
| Extent of expressing your opinion at Organizational/Institutional level | 15.6 (5) | 21.9 (7) | 25.0 (8) | 18.8 (6) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 36.4 (8) | 45.5 (10) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Extent of your participation in organisational/institutional policy-making | 25.0 (8) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 27.3 (6) | 27.3 (6) | 31.8 (7) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Administrative support for research projects | 31.3 (10) | 25.0 (8) | 28.1 (9) | 15.6 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 | 32 | | | | | | | |
| Support for upgrading your skills and knowledge | 28.1 (9) | 34.4 (11) | 25.0 (8) | 9.4 (3) | 3.1 (1) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 9.1 (2) | 45.5 (10) | 27.3 (6) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Gender sensitivity in day to day affairs of your institution/organization | 15.6 (5) | 25.0 (8) | 37.5 (12) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 22.7 (5) | 50.0 (11) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.34: Availability of Computers (SCHOLARS, Multiple Responses)

| Aspects | Percentage |
|------------------------------|------------|
| Department/Centre | 67.6 (23) |
| Faculty/School | 26.5 (9) |
| Centralized University level | 11.8 (4) |
| Library | 17.6 (6) |
| No. Computer for Students | 11.8 (4) |
| No. Computer for Students | 8.8 (3) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.35: Availability of Software for Research (SCHOLARS, Multiple Responses)

| Aspects | Percentage |
|---|------------|
| Latest Version Available | 15.3 (5) |
| Available through Institutional Computers | 58.8 (20) |
| Available through Institutional Sever | 23.5 (8) |
| Open Access Software (s) | 14.7 (5) |
| Not Available at all | 26.5 (9) |
| Others | 11.8 (4) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.36: Places of discussions and debates (SCHOLARS, Multiple Responses)

| Aspects | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Eateries in Campus | 32.4 (11) |
| Hostel | 50.0 (17) |
| Classroom/Presentation Hall | 73.5 (25) |
| Anywhere you feel like in Campus | 38.2 (13) |
| Department/ Centre | 35.3 (12) |
| Others | 8.8 (3) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.37: Perceptions regarding variation in availability of funding

| Perception | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------|----|
| | Not at all | Some less | Moderate | Some more | Very much | Total | N | Not at all | Some less | Moderate | Some more | Very much | No response | Total | N |
| Your discipline vis a vis other disciplines | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 68.8 (22) | 12.5 (4) | 6.3 (2) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 36.4 (8) | 18.2 (4) | 31.8 (7) | 4.5 (1) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Your area of research vis a vis other areas | 3.1 (1) | 12.5 (4) | 62.5 (20) | 18.8 (6) | 3.1 (1) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 36.4 (8) | 31.8 (7) | 18.2 (4) | 4.5 (1) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.38: Gain from sponsored research projects

| Issue | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Not at all | Some less | Moderate | Some more | Very much | Total | N | Not at all | Some less | Moderate | Some more | Very much | Total | N |
| Your Academic pursuit | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 28.1 (9) | 43.8 (14) | 25.0 (8) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 36.4 (8) | 27.3 (6) | 22.7 (5) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Career Progression | 6.3 (2) | 12.5 (4) | 50.0 (0) | 15.6 (5) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1) | 50.0 (0) | 31.8 (7) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Publication(s) | 3.1 (1) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 50.0 (16) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 4.5 (1) | 40.9 (9) | 40.9 (9) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.39: Difficulty in conducting sponsored research projects

| Difficulty | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----|-------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Not at all | Some less | Moderate | Some more | Very much | Total | N | Not at all | Some less | Moderate | Some more | Very much | Total | N |
| Compromising with research interest | 31.3 (10) | 15.6 (5) | 31.3 (10) | 15.6 (5) | 6.3 (2) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 31.8 (7) | 27.3 (6) | 22.7 (5) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Opportunity Cost (Time for your own research) | 9.4 (3) | 40.6 (13) | 25.0 (8) | 12.5 (4) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 | 18.2 (4) | 18.2 (4) | 31.8 (7) | 27.3 (6) | 4.5 (1) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Administrative procedures | 3.1 (1) | 34.4 (11) | 31.3 (10) | 25.0 (8) | 6.3 (2) | 100.0 | 32 | 18.2 (4) | 9.1 (2) | 40.9 (9) | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.40: factors of research collaboration

| Factors | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|----|-------------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|-------|----|
| | Not at all | Less often | Moderate | Often | Very often | Total | N | Not at all | Less often | Moderate | Often | Very often | Total | N |
| Peer-review | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 37.5 (12) | 28.1 (9) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 13.6 (3) | 18.2 (4) | 45.5 | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Sharing ideas and thoughts | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 28.1 (9) | 37.5 (12) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 22.7 (5) | 13.6 (3) | 50.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Complimentary expertise | 9.4 (3) | 9.4 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 37.5 (12) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 45.5 | 40.9 (9) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Recognition | 3.1 (1) | 15.6 (5) | 37.5 (12) | 28.1 (9) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1) | 27.3 (6) | 63.6 | 4.5 (1) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Social Capital | 6.3 (2) | 6.3 (2) | 53.1 (17) | 25.0 (8) | 9.4 (3) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 36.4 (8) | 59.1 (13) | 4.5 (1) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Funding/resources for organization | 6.3 (2) | 9.4 (3) | 34.4 (11) | 28.1 (9) | 21.9 (7) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 36.4 (8) | 54.5 (12) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Publication | 6.3 (2) | 3.1 (1) | 40.6 (13) | 31.3 (10) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | | | | | | | |
| Policy Communication | 9.4 (3) | 18.8 (6) | 37.5 (12) | 25.0 (8) | 9.4 (3) | 100.0 | 32 | | | | | | | |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.41: Factors playing important role(s) in research collaboration

| Factors | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-------|----|-------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------------|-------|----|
| | Very discouraging | Discouraging | Moderate | Helpful | Very helpful | Total | N | Very discouraging | Discouraging | Moderate | Helpful | Very helpful | Total | N |
| Department/Centre | 9.4 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 21.9 (7) | 28.1 (9) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 31.8 (7) | 45.5 (10) | 100.0 | 22 |
| University/Institution | 9.4 (3) | 31.3 (10) | 28.1 (9) | 18.8 (6) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 | | | | | | | |
| Foreign stays/visits for academic purposes | 9.4 (3) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 34.4 (11) | 100.0 | 32 | 9.1 (2) | 4.5 (1) | 27.3 (6) | 27.3 (6) | 31.8 (7) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Policy environment | 12.5 (4) | 12.5 (4) | 34.4 (11) | 21.9 (7) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1) | 45.5 (10) | 31.8 (7) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Your academic background (University) | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 21.9 (7) | 43.8 (14) | 18.8 (6) | 100.0 | 32 | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 18.2 (4) | 22.7 (5) | 36.4 (8) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Location of your work place | 9.4 (3) | 9.4 (3) | 37.5 (12) | 31.3 (10) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 31.8 (7) | 22.7 (5) | 31.8 (7) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Your Publications | 3.1 (1) | 6.3 (2) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 46.9 (15) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 45.5 (10) | 31.8 (7) | 22.7 (5) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Membership of Networks | 6.3 (2) | 9.4 (3) | 18.8 (6) | 50.0 (16) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 22.7 (5) | 22.7 (5) | 36.4 (8) | 13.6 (3) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Gender | 16.7 (5) | 3.3 (1) | 30.0 (10) | 6.7 (2) | 43.3 (13) | 100.0 | 32 | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 31.8 (7) | 13.6 (3) | 31.8 (7) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.42: Opportunities for collaboration

| Factors | Faculty members | | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|----|-------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Very low | Low | Moderate | High | Very high | Total | N | Very low | Low | Moderate | High | Very high | Total | N |
| Within your Discipline | 6.3 (2) | 6.3 (2) | 34.4 (11) | 25.0 (8) | 28.1 (9) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (1) | 31.8 (7) | 27.3 (6) | 36.4 (8) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Across Disciplines | 9.4 (3) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 31.3 (10) | 15.6 (5) | 100.0 | 32 | 4.5 (1) | 18.2 (4) | 36.4 (8) | 22.7 (5) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| In your area of Research | 12.5 (4) | 9.4 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 31.3 (10) | 21.9 (7) | 100.0 | 32 | 0.0 (0) | 22.7 (5) | 13.6 (3) | 27.3 (6) | 36.4 (8) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.43: Perceived lead author for publications by Questionnaire type

| Lead author | Percentage (n) | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|
| | Faculty | | | Researcher | | | Researcher Scholar | | |
| | Journal Article | Book | Technical Report | Journal Article | Book | Technical Report | Journal Article | Book | Technical Report |
| <i>The Senior Most</i> | 12.5 (4) | 15.6 (5) | 12.5 (4) | 9.1 (2) | - | - | 5.9 (2) | 17.6 (6) | 17.6 (6) |
| <i>Who does most of the work</i> | 81.3 | 50.0 (0) | 34.4 (11) | 59.1 (13) | 68.2 (15) | 50.0 (11) | 67.6 (23) | 55.9 (19) | 35.3 (12) |
| <i>Who supervises the research</i> | 6.3 (2) | 21.9 (7) | 37.5 (12) | 18.2 (4) | 22.7 (5) | 36.4 (8) | 8.8 (3) | 17.6 (6) | 38.2 (13) |
| <i>Who initiates (with idea)</i> | - | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 11.8 (4) | 5.9 (2) | 2.9 (1) |
| <i>Decided Alphabetically</i> | - | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | - | - | 4.5 (1) | 2.9 (1) | - | 2.9 (1) |
| <i>Others</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.44: Factors for selecting a journal (SCHOLARS, Multiple Responses)

| Factor | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Timely Publication of volume | 62.5 (20) |
| Peer-review | 84.4 (27) |
| Queue of articles to be published | 43.8 (14) |
| Time taken to get Published | 65.6 (21) |
| Academic rigor | 59.4 (19) |
| Reaching out to series scholars | 31.3 (10) |
| Invitation from the Editor | 28.1 (9) |
| Impact Factor | 56.3 (18) |
| Acquaintance with the Editor/Board | 28.1 (9) |
| Other | 9.4 (3) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.45: Factors applicable of publishing research by research scholars

| Factors | Responses | | | | | | Total | N |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|---|
| | Very poor | Poor | Moderate | Above average | Very much | | | |
| National Journals of good standard favour senior faculty members in publication | 6.1 (2) | 6.1 (2) | 30.3 (10) | 30.3 (10) | 27.3 (9) | 100.0 | 33 | |
| Blind Peer review is the best way to maintain standard/quality | 6.1 (2) | 12.1 (4) | 18.2 (6) | 45.5 (15) | 18.2 (6) | 100.0 | 33 | |
| Peer-reviewed Journals are media to reach at serious scholars | 6.1 (2) | 3.0 (1) | 36.4 (12) | 36.4 (12) | 18.2 (6) | 100.0 | 33 | |
| Publication is required to earn points for recruitment as Assistant Professor | 9.1 (3) | 24.2 (8) | 18.2 (6) | 27.3 (9) | 21.2 (7) | 100.0 | 33 | |
| Peer-reviewed Journals take longer to publish | 3.1 (1) | 15.6 (5) | 37.5 (12) | 21.9 (7) | 21.9 (7) | 100.0 | 32 | |
| Number of publications is more important than the kind of publication | 34.4 (11) | 21.9 (7) | 25.0 (8) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 100.0 | 32 | |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.46: Perception on national or international journal quality

| Issue | Faculty members | | | | | | Researchers | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|-------|-------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------------|-------|----|
| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Total | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Total | N |
| Some National Journals of your discipline are of International standards | 18.8 (6) | 28.1 (9) | 18.8 (6) | 9.4 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 100.0 | 18.2 (4) | 4.5 (1) | 40.9 (9) | 18.2 (4) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| There is huge disparity in terms of quality/standard of International Journals of your discipline | 9.4 (3) | 15.6 (5) | 21.9 (7) | 28.1 (9) | 25.0 (8) | 100.0 | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 31.8 (7) | 27.3 (6) | 22.7 (5) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Peer reviews by International Journals are not always objective | 15.6 (5) | 25.0 (8) | 15.6 (5) | 31.3 (10) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 0.0 (0) | 13.6 (3) | 68.2 (15) | 18.2 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Top International Journals discriminate between scholars of different geographical area/countries | 18.8 (6) | 25.0 (8) | 34.4 (11) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 100.0 | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 59.1 (13) | 13.6 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 100.0 | 22 |
| National Journals of good standard favour senior faculty | 12.5 (4) | 12.5 (4) | 25.0 (8) | 18.8 (6) | 31.3 (10) | 100.0 | 0.0 (0) | 18.2 (4) | 31.8 (7) | 31.8 (7) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Blind Peer review is the best way to maintain standard/quality | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 56.3 (18) | 100.0 | 9.1 (2) | 9.1 (2) | 18.2 (4) | 13.6 (3) | 50.0 (11) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Approval from your organisation before sending article(s) for publication is discouraging | | | | | | | 40.9 (9) | 18.2 (4) | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 18.2 (4) | 100.0 | 22 |
| Research assigned by organisation and sponsored projects leave little scope for pursuing own research interest. | | | | | | | 9.1 (2) | 22.7 (5) | 31.8 (7) | 31.8 (7) | 4.5 (1) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.47: Following citation index

| | Responses | | | | | Total | N |
|-----------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|------------|-------|----|
| | Never | Below average | Moderate | Above average | Very often | | |
| Faculty members | 6.3 (2) | 12.5 (4) | 40.6 (13) | 6.3 (2) | 34.4 (11) | 100.0 | 32 |
| Researchers | 9.1 (2) | 13.6 (3) | 22.7 (5) | 31.8 (7) | 22.7 (5) | 100.0 | 22 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.48: *Language chosen for dissemination (Faculty Members, Multiple Responses)*

| Source | Language (Percentage) | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|
| | Bengali | English | At least one |
| Newspapers | 75 (24) | 71.9 (23) | 100.0 (32) |
| Popular Magazines | 53.1 (17) | 75 (24) | 75.0 (24) |
| Book (s) | 37.5 (12) | 93.8 (30) | 100.0 (32) |
| Journals | 37.5 (12) | 93.8 (30) | 100.0 (32) |
| At least one | 81.3 (26) | 96.9 (31) | - |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.49: Ranking of desire to reach coverage through publications by research scholars

| Coverage | Responses (reported ranks) | | | | | Total | Total rank score | N |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|------------------|----|
| | First | Second | Third | Fourth | Last | | | |
| Regional Community of Scholars | 22.6 (7) | 9.7 (3) | 29.0 (9) | 25.8 (8) | 12.9 (1) | 100.0 | 94 | 31 |
| General Public | 9.7 (3) | 29.0 (9) | 9.7 (3) | 25.8 (8) | 25.8 (8) | 100.0 | 84 | 31 |
| National Community of Scholars | 12.9 (4) | 19.4 (6) | 41.9 | 19.4 (6) | 6.5 (2) | 100.0 | 97 | 31 |
| Policy-Makers | 29.0 (9) | 32.3 (10) | 9.7 (3) | 16.1 (5) | 12.9 (4) | 100.0 | 108 | 31 |
| International Community of Scholars | 22.6 (7) | 12.9 (4) | 16.1 (5) | 12.9 (4) | 35.5 (11) | 100.0 | 85 | 31 |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study

Annex Table 5.50: *Co-authorship (SCHOLARS, Multiple Responses) (S: E03)*

| Co-author | Percentage (n) |
|---|----------------|
| Guide/Mentor | 46.7 (14) |
| Fellow Researcher from your centre/department | 46.7 (14) |
| Ex-colleague | 20.0 (6) |
| Faculty from other Institutions | 33.3 (10) |
| Fellow Researcher from other | 13.3 (4) |

Source: Questionnaire Survey performed under this study