On the Publication Activity of Members
of the Russian Academy of Education (10 years later)

Yuri E. Polak[0000-0001-8411-335X]

Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
47 Nakhimovski Pr., Moscow 117418 Russia
polak@cemi.rssi.ru

Abstract. Based on information from open sources, a table has been compiled reflecting the performance of 128 full members of the Russian Academy of Education in the Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI). The main results are given in a condensed form and compared with the results of a similar study carried out several years earlier. The conclusions and features of the RSCI as an analytical tool are discussed.

Keywords: Russian Academy of Education, Russian Science Citation Index, publication activity

Introduction

One of the indicators of the effectiveness of researchers is their publication activity. In 2009-2010 employees of the Webometrics laboratory of the Institute for Scientific Information and Monitoring of the Russian Academy of Education (INIM RAE) and the Ushinsky Scientific Pedagogical Library conducted research on the publication activity of RAE members. The author took part in this project as a leading research fellow of INIM. In 2019, on his own initiative, he performed a similar work using data recorded by the Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI). The results of this work allow us to trace the dynamics of changes in indicators over 10 years, as well as discuss the possibilities of the RSCI as a tool for measuring scientific productivity.

On Publication Activity of RAE Members 10 Years Back

Methodology and results of that study (2009-10) were described in detail and published in 2011 [2]. The objects of the study were the papers by members of the Russian Academy of Education, who were at that time alive, both full members and corresponding members. A total of 279 persons were examined; their brief biographical data are contained on the RAE website and in [9].

Scopus and Web of Science (Science Citation Index and Social Science Citation Index) were taken as international sources of information. It turned out that international databases quite sparingly reflect the publications of RAE members: the publica-

tions of the majority of scientists are not reflected at all (152 persons did not register works in Scopus, and 230 ones weren't registered by WoS; only 40 and 22 people, respectively had more than 10 publications). The reasons are obvious: the journals in which these authors were published are not represented in the corresponding databases, and the share of their English-language papers is insignificant. Approximately the same situation was observed with the number of citations.

Normative documents for assessing the effectiveness of domestic researchers and scientific organizations unequivocally require along with international databases to use the Russian Science Citation Index. This will be discussed in detail below.

The authors of the study also found it useful to include in the survey of publication activity some data from the Russian Internet sector: web pages dedicated to scientists, their personal sites, and mentions in blogs. Internet publications and other forms of communication via the Internet, if they do not supplant traditional scientific communications, then substantially complement them. The corresponding data are partially described in [2]; they are presented in full in the study report.

As a professional source of information for assessing publication activity, the electronic catalog of the Ushinsky NPB was used. It is in the industry catalog that almost all RAE members are represented (265 out of 279 people). It was assumed that such studies would be repeated. There were all the prerequisites for this. However, life decreed otherwise.

The scientific team of INIM was formed in 1969 on the basis of the laboratory of the Research Institute of Educational Content and Methods in Chernogolovka (near Moscow). In 1989, the Center for Comprehensive Identity Formation of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR was created, which in 2003 was renamed the Center for Experimental Psychodidactics of the Russian Academy of Education (since 2008 - the Institute for Scientific Information and Monitoring). In 2012, after the next renaming, it was called the Institute of Scientific and Pedagogical Information (INIPI RAE). In the institute, such information resources as the Open Archive on Pedagogy, Psychology and Education; the Joint Fund of Electronic Resources for Science and Education OFERNiO were created and had been supported. And then academic reform began. According to the Register of Russian Organizations [13], 'the activities of a legal entity were terminated by reorganization in the form of accession from May 19, 2015'. The assignee became the Institute for Education Management (IUO RAE).

It is appropriate to recall here that the history of Russian Academy of Education dates back to October 6, 1943, when the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, by decree No. 1092, approved the project on the organization of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences [14]. In 1967, the strength of Academy (USSR APN) was established in the amount of 50 full members and 80 corresponding members. RAE became the successor to the Union Academy in 1992

On September 27, 2013, Federal Law No. 253 'On the Russian Academy of Sciences', the reorganization of State Academies of Sciences, and amendments to certain legislative acts of the Russian Federation was adopted. According to the decree No. 1290 of December 26, 2013, research institutes subordinate to RAE were assigned to the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia [15]. In December 2014, the reorganization of the institutes included in the RAE system was carried out: instead of 22, 10

scientific organizations were created. In October 2015, the Ushinsky Scientific Pedagogical Library was attached to the Academy as a structural unit. But in October 2014, the leadership changed in the library, after which its scientific activity sharply decreased.

Thus, from the above information it follows that to date, neither the laboratory staff that performed mentioned research ten years earlier, nor the INIM Institute itself don't exist anymore. Ushinsky Library had lost interest in the project.

Therefore, having decided to repeat the study in 2019, the author, taking into account his own physical capabilities, limited himself to the indicators of the full members of RAE as of early April 2019 and to the information from the RSCI.

On Publication Activity of RAE Members in 2019 (According to the RSCI)

As known, the Russian Science Citation Index has been developed since 2005 by the Scientific Electronic Library. The stated goal of the RSCI is to provide scientific research with relevant reference and bibliographic information and evaluate the effectiveness of the activities of research organizations, researchers, the level of scientific journals, etc. To date, it has become a national-level information and analytical system containing 12+ million publications by Russian scientists, as well as information on citing these publications from 6,000+ journals. The RSCI allows to evaluate the effectiveness of research and to study in detail the statistics of publication activity of more than 600 thousand Russian scientists and 11 thousand scientific organizations belonging to all fields of knowledge. In Russia, the RSCI database is one of the main sources of information for evaluating the effectiveness of research organizations. Thus, the Decree of Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences No. 201 dated October 12, 2010 [16] prescribes the use of indicators such as the number of publications and the citation of employees of a scientific organization in the RSCI, relative to the number of researchers, to evaluate the scientific potential and effectiveness of scientific research.

According to open sources, primarily RAE and RSCI sites, as of April 2019, the academy unites 128 full members, which account for 17,953 registered publications (an average of 140.26 per person) and 397,230 citations (3103.36). The Appendix contains information on the Hirsch index, the number of publications and the number of citations for each academician. The 2011 publication considered materials from 123 academicians of the Russian Academy of Education. Since then, the Academy has replenished with 49 new members, while 44 people dropped out due to natural causes. Thus, 79 persons are present in both lists.

The RAE website contains information on the dates of birth of the Academy members. Simple calculations show that the average age of academics is 75.5 years, while 97 people (75.8%) reached 70 years old and 10 (7.8%) – 90 years old.

Here are the results of a study of publication activity with a breakdown by age groups. Table 1 in the first column shows the age range, N indicates the size of the

corresponding group, P is the average number of publications, C is the average number of citations, H is the average Hirsch index.

Table 1. Publication activity by age.

Age	N	P	C	H
49-59	9	103	938	13
60-69	22	158	3268	18
70-79	52	151	2744	15
80-89	35	131	4472	16
90+	10	109	1771	10
Total	**128**	**140**	**3103**	**15**

As noted above, for 79 people there are RSCI data from both studies. It is of some interest to compare their indicators before and now.

Table 2. Change of average indicators.

Year	Persons	Publ (average)	Cit (average)	H
2019	128	140	3103	15
2010	123	11	48	-
		In both studies		
2019	79	140	3472	
2010	79	10	50	

And a few more facts about the first study (the values of Hirsch index were not fixed in it). Then 38 scientists did not have publications recorded in the RSCI, and 51 people did not have citations. At the same time, 6 academicians had at least 50 publications, and 13 - at least 100 citations. Note that in 2019 only 3 members of the academy had zeros in the corresponding columns.

The last indicators need some comments. It is noteworthy that, ceteris paribus, scientists in recent years have 13 times more publications than in their entire previous lives, and almost 70 times more citations. Let us offer the following considerations as an explanation. First, as indicated above, the RSCI database began to be formed in 2005, and at first it was replenished rather slowly. But after Presidium of the Higher Attestation Commission called the availability of scientific periodicals in the RSCI system as a necessary condition for their inclusion in the Higher Attestation Commission list [4], the growth accelerated noticeably. Besides, the information base of the RSCI expanded significantly after the inclusion of information on domestic journals extracted from Scopus in the database.

Secondly, the mentioned Decree No. 201 on the methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of scientific organizations' activities played a role. In this connection, we will also name the governmental decree No. 312 of April 8, 2009 [17], which prescribes to divide organizations into three categories depending on their achievements. Institutions seeking to raise their position (and receive increased funding) try to improve their performance. The RSCI meets them: by concluding a contract and paying the appropriate fee, the organization gains access to databases and can correct errors in job descriptions and bibliographies, add citations and publications absent from the

database, including monographs and proceedings of conferences, make other changes and additions. After making additions or corrections, the publication is checked manually by the RSCI staff and can be returned for revision or rejected. In 2011, scientists and authors of publications got the opportunity to correct their entries at the RSCI. Academicians of the Russian Academy of Education, who are mostly the heads of scientific departments and organizations, have enough resources to increase their 'scientific weight'.

The author (not being RAE academician) can illustrate the dynamics of the growth of indicators in the RSCI using his own statistics as an example. In 2014, the system recorded 34 publications with 70 citations and the Hirsch index H = 2 Now these numbers look like this: 185, 749, 13 This growth was achieved mainly due to the inclusion of publications from previous years that were not mentioned at the RSCI before.

RSCI in the Eyes of Researchers

The RSCI is not free from internal defects and vulnerable to external manipulations. In articles [5, 6], Professor N.E. Kalyonov gives numerous examples of incorrect operation of the algorithms and software of the RSCI. Demonstrating screenshots, he convincingly substantiates his claims to the completeness, relevance, and accuracy of data processing algorithms in the RSCI. In particular, on the materials of his own publications, he found out that with certain requests the system displays more papers from himself than from his organization as a whole. As a result, the conclusion is made: 'In the form in which the RSCI is currently presented on the NEB website, using the system as a tool to assess the efficiency of the activities of research organizations, researches, the level of scientific journals, etc. is impossible' [5, p.12].

A few years later, Professor A.L. Fradkov makes a similar judgment: 'The RSCI continues to distort scientometric data of scientists and does not try to correct them systematically. It is impossible to use these data for evaluating scientists, journals and organizations' [10, p.5]. And he explains the reasons for this with both objective difficulties ('the problem of namesakes is not easy, if solved without the help of the authors'), and the conscious actions of the leadership ('RSCI is ready to turn its system into a garbage can and enter everything there just to pay'. We meet the same assessments with Professor R.M. Khantemirov: 'The RSCI only brings harm. This harm is connected, firstly, with the fact that the base of the RSCI magazines resembles a huge garbage dump in which it is not easy to find anything worthwhile. And, secondly, with the fraudulentness of individual authors and journals that took on rampant proportions when rising up their bibliometric indicators, while the RSCI leadership indulges in its fundamental unwillingness to counteract' [12, p.6]. So, according to him, the Siberian Pedagogical Journal increased its impact factor with the help of primitive fraud. The scheme is simple: 'verified' authors insert dozens of links to relevant journals into texts of several pages. Note that similar proposals were received by the author [18]. Poor quality papers, prepaid and not checked for plagiarism are often used to artificially increase citation. Trash magazines make a profitable busi-

ness. This practice discredits not only the use of scientometric indicators, but also the very scientific activity in Russia.

In fairness, it must be noted: the requirements of the Ministry of Education and Science to increase the number and citation of publications put scientists in a situation where the desire to comply with ethical standards conflicts with material interest. 'Often, the bosses themselves, in the pursuit of ratings, force them to violate ethical standards under the threat of demotion, job cuts, dismissal, dissolution of departments and laboratories, etc. Therefore, ethical standards are actually violated under pressure from above' [11, p.5]. Correcting the situation requires the efforts of both the scientific community, and journal editions, and the political will of the governing bodies.

Conclusion

As for the RSCI, recent positive changes have been evident. Responding to fair criticism, RSCI experts began to monitor the publication activities of journals and abstracts of conferences. In April 2017, Mr G.O.Eremenko, the General Director of eLibrary.Ru, announced at the conference 'Scientific publication of an international level: the world practice of preparing and promoting publications' about the exclusion of 344 'junk' magazines from the RSCI [3]. The materials of 'correspondence' multidisciplinary conferences are in queue for the next step.

It has been noted more than once that quantitative scientometric indicators should not be used to evaluate the effectiveness of scientists [1,7,8]: they are vulnerable to manipulation; they can be ambiguous. Perhaps the most distorted picture is formalization in the humanities (we note that it is the humanities that prevail in RAE). As a rule, they have low indices in the bibliometric databases WoS and Scopus. In the humanities, it is customary to present the results of studies in the form of monographs and articles in thematic collections that fall outside the scope of these databases. In addition, the national specificity of the subject of study is often uninteresting to foreign audience, nd many leading journals do not have an English version.

However, the value of the RSCI should not be underestimated. It actually became a national information-analytical system with data on publications and citation of these publications. The created analytical apparatus provides a detailed and visual representation of information. It provides the aforementioned humanities with a more complete and objective picture than WoS and Scopus. And it should be treated not as the main criterion for the quality of scientific work, but as an analysis tool for researchers and experts.

Materials of the report at the XXI All-Russian Scientific Conference 'Scientific Service on the Internet' (September 2019) are used in the article.

References

1. Antopol'skij, A.B.: Principy sistemy nauchnoj informacii v Rossijskoj akademii obrazovaniya. Informacionnye resursy Rossii 4 (110), pp. 16–22 (2009).

2. Antopol'skij, A.B., Polyak, Yu.E.: Ob issledovanii publikacionnoj aktivnosti uchenyh (na primere chlenov Rossijskoj akademii obrazovaniya). Informacionnye resursy Rossii 1 (119), pp. 26–30 (2011).

3. Eremenko, G.O.: Aktual'nye problemy sovremennoj nauchnoj periodiki: musornye zhurnaly i retrakciya statej, https://conf.neicon.ru/materials/26-Domestic0417/170419-06-Eremenko.pdf, last accessed 2019/11/21.

4. Informacionnoe soobshchenie №45.1-132 ot 14.10.2008 o poryadke formirovaniya Perechnya vedushchih recenziruemyh nauchnyh zhurnalov i izdanij, v kotoryh dolzhny byt' opublikovany osnovnye nauchnye rezul'taty dissertacij na soiskanie uchenoj stepeni doktora i kandidata nauk, https://elibrary.ru/projects/events/vak/infletter-14-10-2008.doc.

5. Kalyonov, N.E.: Eshche raz o RINC (pis'mo Ministru obrazovaniya i nauki RF Fursenko A.A.). Troickij variant-Nauka 71, 4 (2011).

6. Kalyonov, N.E., Selyuckaya, O.V.: Nekotorye ocenki kachestva Rossijskogo indeksa nauchnogo citirovaniya na primere zhurnala «Informacionnye resursy Rossii». Informacionnye resursy Rossii 6 (118), pp. 2–13 (2010).

7. Polyak, Yu.E.: Naukometricheskie pokazateli v ocenke deyatel'nosti uchenyh i organizacij. Distancionnoe i virtual'noe obuchenie 8, 101–106 (2014).

8. Polyak, Yu.E.: Ocenivanie i ranzhirovanie veb-sajtov. Vebometricheskie rejtingi. Nauchnyj redaktor i izdatel' 1, pp. 19–29 (2017).

9. Rossijskaya akademiya obrazovaniya. Personal'nyj sostav, 1943–2013. NPB im. K.D.Ushinskogo, Moscow (2013).

10. Fradkov A.L.: RINC prodolzhaet vrat'. Troickij variant-Nauka 187, 5 (2015).

11. Fradkov, A.L.: RINC uchit vrat'? Troickij variant-Nauka 189, 5 (2015).

12. Hantemirov R.M.: RINC: ot primitivnogo moshennichestva do rastleniya maloletnih. Troickij variant-Nauka 163, 6 (2014).

13. Organizaciya FGBNU «INIPI RAO», http://www.list-org.com/company/824439, last accessed 2019/11/21.

14. Ob organizacii Akademii pedagogicheskih nauk RSFSR, http://rusacademedu.ru/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/postanovlenie_1943_1092_.pdf, last accessed 2019/11/21.

15. O federal'nyh organah ispolnitel'noj vlasti, upolnomochennyh osushchestvlyat' funkcii i polnomochiya uchreditelya i sobstvennika imushchestva organizacij, nahodivshihsya v vedenii Rossijskoj akademii obrazovaniya, http://government.ru/docs/9585, last accessed 2019/11/21.

16. Ob utverzhdenii Polozheniya o Komissii po ocenke rezul'tativnosti deyatel'nosti nauchnyh organizacij Rossijskoj akademii nauk i Metodiki ocenki rezul'tativnosti deyatel'nosti nauchnyh organizacij Rossijskoj akademii nauk, http://www.ras.ru/presidium/documents/directions.aspx?ID=9767952e-4821-4510-89d6-5f678677066d, last accessed 2019/11/21.

17. Ob ocenke i o monitoringe rezul'tativnosti deyatel'nosti nauchnyh organizacij, vypolnyayushchih nauchno-issledovatel'skie, opytno-konstruktorskie i tekhnologicheskie raboty grazhdanskogo naznacheniya, http://www.pravo.gov.ru/proxy/ips/?docbody=&nd=102128788, last accessed 2019/11/21.

18. Polyak, Yu.E.: O metodah povysheniya impakt-faktora. In: Telematika-2014. Trudy XXI Vserossijskoj nauchno-metodicheskoj konferencii, pp. 49–51. LITMO, SPb (2014).

19. Polyak, Yu.E.: Naidetsya vse. Esli umet' iskat'. Informacionnye resursy Rossii 1–2 (64–65), pp. 44–48 (2002).

302

Appendix. Indicators of publication activity of RAE members
(P is the number of publications, C is the number of citations, H is the Hirsch index)

Name (in the order of Russian alphabet)	H	2019		2010	
		P	C	P	C
ABULKHANOVA Ksenia Alexandrovna	38	154	19877	6	45
ALASHKEVICH Yuri Davydovich	7	197	387		
AMONASHVILI Shalva Alexandrovich	9	111	5596	4	0
ANTONOVA Irina Alexandrovna	0	1	0	0	0
ANTONOVA Lidiya Nikolaevna	9	73	369		
ASMOLOV Alexander Grigorievich	32	336	19442	51	830
BAEVA Irina Alexandrovna	19	172	2470		
BASHMAKOV Mark Ivanovich	8	199	754	1	6
BEZRUKIKH Maryam Moiseevna	21	215	4987	30	274
BELOUSOV Lev Sergeevich	8	143	183		
BERULAVA Galina Alekseevna	21	67	2283		
BERULAVA Mikhail Nikolaevich	17	98	2921	1	0
BESPALKO Vladimir Pavlovich	18	97	12069	18	7
BIM-BAD Boris Mikhailovich	17	152	3194	6	4
BOLOTOV Victor Alexandrovich	19	152	4979		
BONDYREVA Svetlana Konstantinovna	20	95	2156	4	101
BORDOVSKAYA Nina Valentinovna	19	149	5500	0	0
BORDOVSKY Gennady Alekseevich	20	555	3458	63	221
BORISENKOV Vladimir Panteleimonovich	11	77	934	18	38
BUYEVA Lyudmila Panteleevna	9	69	2692	0	0
VERBITSKAYA Lyudmila Alekseevna	11	130	1597	5	21
VERBITSKY Andrey Alexandrovich	32	354	16869		
GAYDAMASHKO Igor Vyacheslavovich	8	60	347		
GALAZHINSKY Eduard Vladimirovich	16	103	1885		
GARAJA Victor Ivanovich	7	28	1027	1	2
GAFUROV Ilshat Rafkatovich	13	87	688		
GEVORKYAN Elena Nikolaevna	15	81	948		
GLEYSER Grigory Davydovich	6	31	352	0	0
GRANIK Henrietta Grigoryevna	7	74	733	0	0
DARMODEKHIN Sergey Vladimirovich	9	62	476	9	23
DEDEGKAEV Victor Khasanbievich	3	27	31		
DEMIN Vadim Petrovich	1	13	6		
DERKACH Anatoly Alekseevich	25	162	9961	20	349
DZHURINSKY Alexander Naumovich	27	218	4391		
DONTSOV Alexander Ivanovich	20	130	3324	1	0
DRONOV Victor Pavlovich	9	87	390		
DUBROVINA Irina Vladimirovna	17	188	2480	0	0
ERMAKOV Pavel Nikolaevich	14	178	1204		
ZHURAVLEV Anatoly Laktionovich	68	792	16298		
ZHURAKOVSKY Vasily Maximilianovich	15	100	1271	5	5
ZAGVYAZINSKY Vladimir Ilyich	45	263	11625	33	142
ZAPESOTSKY Alexander Sergeevich	28	370	3925	29	62
ZAKHLEBNY Anatoly Nikiforovich	13	96	1501		
ZIMNYAYA Irina Alekseevna	24	101	18378	42	482
ZINCHENKO Yuri Petrovich	23	208	2031		
IVANNIKOV Vyacheslav Andreevich	13	61	1308		
KANDYBOVICH Sergey Lvovich	8	68	566		

KARAMURZOV Barasbi Suleymanovich	10	171	734		
KEZINA Lyubov Petrovna	1	3	45	1	0
KINELEV Vladimir Georgievich	13	77	1556	2	6
KISELEV Alexander Fedotovich	12	119	580	31	9
KOROLKOV Alexander Arkadevich	10	177	1118	4	8
KOSTOMAROV Vitaliy Grigorievich	19	222	13176	4	1
KUZNETSOV Alexander Andreevich	23	221	2734	0	0
KUKUSHKINA Olga Ilinichna	12	99	1200		
KURAKOV Lev Panteleimonovich	8	92	1684	5	15
KUTSEV Gennady Filippovich	17	122	1079		
LAZAREV Valery Semenovich	29	143	4339	4	5
LAPTEV Vladimir Valentinovich	19	239	1195	10	58
LAPCHIK Mikhail Pavlovich	22	100	2297	1	18
LEBEDEV Yuri Alexandrovich	5	38	89	0	0
LEVITSKY Mikhail Lvovich	9	82	309	0	0
LECTORSKI Vladislav Alexandrovich	42	282	9966	4	14
LIFEROV Anatoly Petrovich	15	123	1127	5	5
LIKHANOV Albert Anatolyevich	2	22	68	1	0
LOMOV Stanislav Petrovich	2	66	582	0	0
MAKSIMOVICH Valentina Fedorovna	6	23	170	0	0
MALOFEEV Nikolay Nikolaevich	21	128	2836	29	83
MALYKH Sergey Borisovich	22	241	1937		
MALYSHEV Vladimir Sergeevich	2	23	28		
MANUSHIN Eduard Anatolevich	16	74	852	0	0
MARTIROSYAN Boris Pasterovich	7	22	530	0	0
MEDVEDEV Leonid Georgievich	9	23	248		
MINDIASHVILI Dmitry Georgievich	11	21	571		
MIKHAILOVA Evgenia Isaevna	6	41	173		
MIKHAILOVA Natalya Ivanovna	3	20	90	0	0
MUKHINA Valeria Sergeevna	21	281	7814	26	66
MYASNIKOV Vladimir Afanasevich	8	81	463	7	6
NEVERKOVICH Sergey Dmitrievich	18	163	1940		
NEMENSKY Boris Mikhailovich	5	26	676	0	0
NECHAEV Nikolay Nikolaevich	10	81	1715	3	13
NIKANDROV Nikolay Dmitrievich	18	220	4937	15	9
NIKITIN Alexander Alexandrovich	5	91	469	5	1
OMAROV Omar Alievich	7	155	532	26	23
ORLOV Alexander Andreevich	19	128	2179		
PATOV Nikolay Alexandrovich	6	22	98		
PODDYAKOV Nikolay Nikolaevich	9	32	748	0	0
PODUFALOV Nikolay Dmitrievich	4	43	181	7	9
PONOMARENKO Vladimir Alexandrovich	18	332	5345	9	18
POPKOV Vladimir Andreevich	23	306	3017	14	11
POTASHNIK Mark Matusovich	15	224	4021	0	0
REAN Arthur Alexandrovich	22	165	11794		
ROBERT Irena Venyaminovna	24	208	7353	10	15
RUBTSOV Vitaliy Vladimirovich	25	223	3524	8	10
RYZHAKOV Mikhail Viktorovich	14	110	1095	38	77
SEYRANOV Sergey Germanovich	20	157	1419		
SEMYONOV Alexey Lvovich	9	119	1037		
SEN'KO Yuri Vasilievich	26	150	4346	25	59
SERGEEV Nikolay Konstantinovich	10	93	1174		

SINENKO Vasily Yakovlevich	9	69	502		
SLONIMSKY Sergey Mikhailovich	10	79	686	0	0
SMOLIN Oleg Nikolaevich	12	196	1223		
SMOLYANINOVA Olga Georgievna	13	132	1239		
SOBKIN Vladimir Samuilovich	26	413	4394	13	95
SOVETOV Boris Yakovlevich	15	110	2754	4	16
SOLOMIN Yuri Methodievich	0	0	0		
STRIKHANOV Mikhail Nikolaevich	64	534	18346		
TAYURSKY Anatoly Ivanovich	5	71	128	8	0
TIKTINSKY-SHKLOVSKY Victor Markovich	10	139	920	0	0
TRYAPITSYNA Alla Prokofievna	36	434	5058		
THAKUSHINOV Aslancheriy Kitovich	7	37	206		
USANOV Vladimir Evgenievich	9	71	356		
USHAKOVA Tatyana Nikolaevna	22	129	3566	15	49
FARBER Deborah Aronovna	21	131	4513	46	476
FILIPPOV Vladimir Mikhailovich	16	166	1979	51	97
FOKHT-BABUSHKIN Yuri Ulrichovich	2	3	193	0	0
KHALEEVA Irina Ivanovna	7	26	2654	7	0
TSVETKOVA Larisa Alexandrovna	9	85	378		
TSIRULNIKOV Anatoly Markovich	6	45	539		
CHEBYSHEV Nikolay Vasilievich	6	83	636	4	22
CHISTYAKOVA Svetlana Nikolaevna	17	160	2986		
SHADRIKOV Vladimir Dmitrievich	34	257	14528	21	59
SCHOLAR Lyudmila Valentinovna	6	95	665	1	0
SCHETININ Mikhail Petrovich	0	0	0	0	0
SCHUKIN Evgeny Dmitrievich	21	530	5172	0	0
ERDNIEV Pyurvya Muchkaevich	11	61	1227	0	0
ESKINDAROV Mukhadin Abdurakhmanovich	44	215	6350		
YAMBURG Evgeny Sholomovich	9	74	979		