

*Monthly Multidisciplinary  
Research Journal*

*Review Of  
Research Journal*

---

Chief Editors

**Ashok Yakkaldevi**  
A R Burla College, India

**Ecaterina Patrascu**  
Spiru Haret University, Bucharest

**Kamani Perera**  
Regional Centre For Strategic Studies,  
Sri Lanka

Review Of Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial Board readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

**Regional Editor**

Dr. T. Manichander

*Advisory Board*

Kamani Perera Regional Centre For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Mabel Miao Center for China and Globalization, China
Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Xiaohua Yang University of San Francisco, San Francisco	Ruth Wolf University Walla, Israel
Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Karina Xavier Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), USA	Jie Hao University of Sydney, Australia
Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania	May Hongmei Gao Kennesaw State University, USA	Pei-Shan Kao Andrea University of Essex, United Kingdom
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Marc Fetscherin Rollins College, USA	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania
	Liu Chen Beijing Foreign Studies University, China	Ilie Pinteau Spiru Haret University, Romania
Mahdi Moharrampour Islamic Azad University buinzahra Branch, Qazvin, Iran	Nimita Khanna Director, Isara Institute of Management, New Delhi	Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai
Titus Pop PhD, Partium Christian University, Oradea, Romania	Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur	Sonal Singh Vikram University, Ujjain
J. K. VIJAYAKUMAR King Abdullah University of Science & Technology, Saudi Arabia.	P. Malyadri Government Degree College, Tandur, A.P.	Jayashree Patil-Dake MBA Department of Badruka College Commerce and Arts Post Graduate Centre (BCCAPGC), Kachiguda, Hyderabad
George - Calin SERITAN Postdoctoral Researcher Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences Al. I. Cuza University, Iasi	S. D. Sindkhedkar PSGVP Mandal's Arts, Science and Commerce College, Shahada [ M.S. ]	Maj. Dr. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director, Hyderabad AP India.
REZA KAFIPOUR Shiraz University of Medical Sciences Shiraz, Iran	Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	AR. SARAVANAKUMAR LAGAPPA UNIVERSITY, KARAIKUDI, TN
Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur	C. D. Balaji Panimalar Engineering College, Chennai	V. MAHALAKSHMI Dean, Panimalar Engineering College
Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya	Bhavana vivek patole PhD, Elphinstone college mumbai-32	S. KANNAN Ph.D , Annamalai University
	Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary, Play India Play (Trust), Meerut (U.P.)	Kanwar Dinesh Singh Dept. English, Government Postgraduate College , solan

More.....



## LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES AND LEARNING STYLE PREFERENCES OF TEACHER TRAINEES IN LEARNING ENGLISH AS SECOND LANGUAGE

N. G. Jyothsna<sup>1</sup> and Dr. P. Nithila Devakarunyam<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. Scholar, St.Christopher's College of Education, Vepery, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

<sup>2</sup>Principal, St.Christopher's College of Education, Vepery, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.



### ABSTRACT:

**T**his study was explored to find out the language learning strategies and learning style preferences of teacher trainees in learning English as a second language in Chennai. A sample of 400 B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. trainees was selected for the study. Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning and Joy Reid's Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire were used for data collection. Data was analyzed by t-test. Results showed that the two most often used language learning strategy of teacher trainees are metacognitive and social strategies and the two most preferred learning styles of teacher trainees are tactile and visual learning styles.

**KEYWORDS:** Language Learning Strategies, Learning Style Preferences, Teacher Trainees, English as Second Language.

### INTRODUCTION

English being the second language of our country is the secondary vehicle for communication. Learning a second language is a step-by-step process. Language learning strategies are the often-conscious steps or behaviors used by language learners to enhance the acquisition, storage, retention, recall, and use of new information (Rigney, 1978; Oxford, 1990). In the second language learning, Language Learning Strategies, have come to be applied to the conscious moves made by the second language learner intended to be useful in either learning or using the second language. According to Oxford (1990), Language Learning Strategies are "specific actions, behaviors, steps or techniques that students often intentionally use to improve their progress in developing second language skills. These strategies can facilitate the internalization, storage, retrieval, or use of the new language. Language strategies are tools for the self-directed involvement necessary for developing communicative ability".

At this juncture, it is important to differentiate Language Learning Strategies from Learning Styles. Learning Styles are the learner's natural habitual or preferred mode of absorbing, processing and retaining aspects of the target language. Reid defines Perceptual Learning Style as "the variations among learners in using one or more senses to understand, organize, and retain experience" (Reid, 1987). Learning Styles along with Language Learning Strategies help in the better language learning outcome. In order to do that, they must be well aware of methods or techniques or approaches that help them in learning effectively. This research work is conceived to identify the Language Learning Strategies and preferred Learning Styles of teacher trainees from various Teacher Training Institutes in Chennai.

**SAMPLE**

The sample consisted of 400 teacher trainees (B.Ed./D.El.Ed) from various Teacher Training Institutes in Chennai.

**Tool 1: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Rebecca Oxford**

The SILL version 7.0 is a self-report instrument devised by Rebecca Oxford which assesses the frequency with which the learners use for English language learning. This version comprising of 50 statements is for learners of English as a Second Language. The inventory covers six types of Language Learning Strategies - Memory (statements 1-9), Cognitive (statements 10-23), Compensation (statements 24-29), Metacognitive (statements 30-38), Affective (statements 39-44) and Social (statements 45-50) strategies. The first three types of strategies - Memory, Cognitive, and Compensation - are collectively termed as Direct Strategies while the remaining three strategies - Metacognitive, Affective and Social strategies are termed as Indirect Strategies. The SILL is evaluated on a five point Likert scale ranging from 1-5 for all the 50 items. The number indicates how often the strategies are used by the learner. The scores are categorized as High (ranging from 3.5 to 5.0), Medium (ranging from 2.5 to 3.4) and Low (ranging from 1.0 to 2.4).

**Tool 2: Perceptual Learning Style Preference Questionnaire (PLSPQ) by Joy Reid**

The PLSPQ developed by Joy Reid for non-native speakers was used to study the preferred Learning Styles of the learners. It is the first learning style measure used widely in the ESL/EFL field. This questionnaire consists of 30 statements in random order for six learning style preferences with five statements on each learning style - Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic, Tactile, Group and Individual. This questionnaire is a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Reid set cut off points for Learning Style and classified them as Major (ranging from 38-50), Minor (ranging from 25- 37) and Negligible (ranging from 0-24) Learning Styles.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA**

$H_01$ : There is no significant difference between B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. teacher trainees in using the following language learning strategies - memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social.

**Table 1: Language Learning Strategies of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees**

Language Learning Strategies	Course	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Memory	B.Ed.	200	2.744	0.7234	0.096	0.923
	D.El.Ed.	200	2.738	0.6543		
Cognitive	B.Ed.	200	3.120	0.6775	0.274	0.784
	D.El.Ed.	200	3.137	0.5955		
Compensation	B.Ed.	200	2.984	0.7594	0.384	0.701
	D.El.Ed.	200	3.045	2.1197		
Metacognitive	B.Ed.	200	3.902	2.5450	1.655	0.099
	D.El.Ed.	200	3.590	0.7803		
Affective	B.Ed.	200	2.990	1.6460	1.159	0.247
	D.El.Ed.	200	2.839	0.8000		
Social	B.Ed.	200	3.376	0.9417	0.546	0.231
	D.El.Ed.	200	3.267	0.8653		

Table-1 shows that there is no significant difference between B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. teacher trainees in using language learning strategies since the p-values are greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis-1 is accepted.

$H_02$ : There is no significant difference between male and female teacher trainees in using the following language learning strategies - memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social.

**Table 2: Language Learning Strategies of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees based on Gender**

Language Learning Strategies	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Memory	Male	110	2.658	0.7767	1.363	0.175
	Female	290	2.772	0.6512		
Cognitive	Male	110	2.983	3.184	2.846	0.005*
	Female	290	3.184	0.6219		
Compensation	Male	110	2.957	0.8038	0.445	0.657
	Female	290	3.037	1.8019		
Metacognitive	Male	110	3.910	3.3733	1.073	0.284
	Female	290	3.683	0.7791		
Affective	Male	110	2.778	0.8999	1.298	0.195
	Female	290	2.966	1.4138		
Social	Male	110	3.137	0.8966	2.528	0.012*
	Female	290	3.392	0.8996		

Table-2 depicts that there is a significant difference between male and female teacher trainees in using cognitive strategy since the p-value is lesser than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis-2 is rejected for the cognitive strategy. From the mean scores, it is evident that the female D.El.Ed. teacher trainees are better at using memory, and social strategies than male teacher trainees.

**H<sub>0</sub>3:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban pre-service teachers in using the following language learning strategies - memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social.

**Table 3: Language Learning Strategies of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees based on Nativity**

Language Learning Strategies	Nativity	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Memory	Rural	261	2.769	0.6637	1.109	0.268
	Urban	139	2.688	0.7334		
Cognitive	Rural	261	3.124	0.6533	0.210	0.834
	Urban	139	3.138	0.6075		
Compensation	Rural	261	3.088	1.8969	1.266	0.206
	Urban	139	2.877	0.7109		
Metacognitive	Rural	261	3.813	2.2577	0.977	0.329
	Urban	139	3.619	0.8127		
Affective	Rural	261	2.891	0.8681	0.501	0.617
	Urban	139	2.959	1.8502		
Social	Rural	261	3.328	0.9088	0.200	0.842
	Urban	139	3.309	0.9003		

Table-3 evident that there is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in using language learning strategies since the p-value is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis-3 is accepted.

**H<sub>0</sub>4:** There is no significant difference in the teacher trainees studying in various types of colleges in their usage of the following language learning strategy - memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social.

**Table 4: Language Learning Strategies of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees based on Management Type**

Strategies	Source of Variation	Df	SS	MS	F	p-value
Memory	Between	2	6.257	3.128	6.784	0.001*
	Within	397	183.078	0.461		
	Total	399	189.334			
Cognitive	Between	2	2.514	1.257	3.130	0.045
	Within	397	159.412	0.402		
	Total	399	161.926			
Compensation	Between	2	15.033	7.516	3.001	0.051
	Within	397	994.260	2.504		
	Total	399	1009.293			
Metacognitive	Between	2	1.101	0.551	0.154	0.857
	Within	397	1418.732	3.574		
	Total	399	1419.833			
Affective	Between	2	18.980	9.490	5.798	0.003*
	Within	397	649.796	1.637		
	Total	399	668.776			
Social	Between	2	4.236	2.118	2.608	0.075
	Within	397	322.405	0.812		
	Total	399	326.641			

Table-4 reveals that there is a significant difference between the teacher trainees studying in government, aided and self-financing colleges in using memory and affective strategies since the p-value is lesser than 0.05. Hence the following post-hoc tests were conducted for memory and affective strategies.

**Table 5: Post- Hoc Test for the Visual, and Group Style of Teacher Trainees' Studying in Government, Aided and Self-Financing Institutions**

Language Learning Strategies	Management Type	N	Mean	Management Type	N	Mean	p-value
Memory	Government	102	2.759	Aided	116	2.916	0.152
	Aided	116	2.916	Self-Financing	182	2.619	0.000*
	Government	102	2.759	Self-Financing	182	2.619	0.239
Affective	Government	102	3.036	Aided	116	3.684	0.779
	Aided	116	3.684	Self-Financing	182	3.741	0.034*
	Government	102	3.036	Self-Financing	182	3.741	0.002*

Table-5 shows that there is a significant difference between teacher trainees studying in aided and self-financing institutions in using their memory strategy. There is also a significant difference between teacher trainees studying in aided and self-financing institutions & government and self-financing institutions in using their affective strategy. Hence the null hypothesis-4 is rejected for memory and affective strategies.

**H<sub>0</sub>5:** There is no significant difference between B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. teacher trainees in using the following learning style preferences in English language learning - visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group and individual.

**Table 6: Learning Style Preferences of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees**

Style	Course	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Visual	B.Ed.	200	26.77	6.496	4.508	0.000*
	D.El.Ed.	200	23.98	5.866		
Auditory	B.Ed.	200	24.54	6.631	0.716	0.474
	D.El.Ed.	200	25.01	6.494		
Kinesthetic	B.Ed.	200	24.51	6.422	1.227	0.221
	D.El.Ed.	200	25.25	5.616		
Tactile	B.Ed.	200	24.59	5.530	3.059	0.002*
	D.El.Ed.	200	26.38	6.155		
Group	B.Ed.	200	23.50	6.343	5.516	0.000*
	D.El.Ed.	200	27.22	7.122		
Individual	B.Ed.	200	23.58	6.452	1.207	0.228
	D.El.Ed.	200	22.82	6.141		

Table-6 depicts that there is a significant difference between B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. teacher trainees in the visual, tactile and group learning styles since the p-values are lesser than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis-5 is rejected for the visual, tactile and group learning styles. From the mean scores, it is evident that the B.Ed. teacher trainees prefer visual and individual learning styles while D.El.Ed. teacher trainees prefer tactile and group learning styles.

**H<sub>0</sub>6:** There is no significant difference between male and female teacher trainees in using the following Learning style preferences in English language learning - visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group and individual.

**Table 7: Learning Style Preferences of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees based on Gender**

Style	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Visual	Male	110	25.40	6.222	0.049	0.961
	Female	290	25.37	6.391		
Auditory	Male	110	23.38	6.398	2.636	0.009*
	Female	290	25.30	6.552		
Kinesthetic	Male	110	24.67	6.150	0.423	0.673
	Female	290	24.96	6.002		
Tactile	Male	110	24.27	5.482	2.543	0.011*
	Female	290	25.94	6.012		
Group	Male	110	24.04	6.569	2.346	0.019*
	Female	290	25.86	7.087		
Individual	Male	110	23.20	6.424	0.000	1.000
	Female	290	23.20	6.267		

Table-7 reveals that there is a significant difference between male and female teacher trainees in the auditory, tactile and group learning styles since the p-values are lesser than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis-6 is rejected for the auditory, tactile and group learning styles. From the mean scores, it is evident that female teacher trainees prefer auditory, tactile, and group learning styles than male teacher trainees.

**H<sub>0</sub>7:** There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in using the following learning style preferences in English language learning - visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group and individual.

**Table 8: Learning Style Preferences of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees based on Nativity**

Style	Nativity	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Visual	Rural	261	25.38	6.322	0.019	0.985
	Urban	139	25.37	6.389		
Auditory	Rural	261	24.88	6.691	0.443	0.658
	Urban	139	24.58	6.321		
Kinesthetic	Rural	261	24.89	5.957	0.040	0.968
	Urban	139	24.86	6.204		
Tactile	Rural	261	25.48	6.261	0.028	0.978
	Urban	139	25.50	5.215		
Group	Rural	261	25.64	7.420	1.098	0.273
	Urban	139	24.83	6.086		
Individual	Rural	261	23.16	6.581	0.153	0.878
	Urban	139	23.27	5.764		

Table-8 evident that there is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in all the learning styles since the p-value for all the learning styles is greater than 0.05. Hence the null hypothesis-7 is accepted.

**H<sub>0</sub>8:** There is no significant difference in the teacher trainees' studying in various types of colleges in their usage of the following learning style preferences in English language learning - visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group and individual.

**Table 9: Learning Style Preferences of B.Ed. & D.El.Ed. Teacher Trainees based on Management Type**

Style	Source of Variation	Df	SS	MS	F	p-value
Visual	Between	2	127.229	63.614	1.589	0.205
	Within	397	15896.521	40.042		
	Total	399	16023.750			
Auditory	Between	2	274.976	137.488	3.232	0.045
	Within	397	16888.774	42.541		
	Total	399	17163.750			
Kinesthetic	Between	2	183.720	91.860	2.541	0.080
	Within	397	14354.520	36.157		
	Total	399	14538.240			
Tactile	Between	2	338.319	169.159	4.935	0.008*
	Within	397	13607.591	34.276		
	Total	399	13945.910			
Group	Between	2	158.845	79.422	1.632	0.197
	Within	397	19325.315	48.678		
	Total	399	19484.160			
Individual	Between	2	91.897	45.949	1.158	0.315
	Within	397	15756.103	39.688		
	Total	399	15848.000			

Table-9 shows that there is a significant difference between the teacher trainees from government, aided and self-financing colleges in tactile learning style since p-value is lesser than 0.05. Hence the following post-hoc tests were done for these learning styles.



**Table 10: Post- Hoc Test for Visual & Group Style of Teacher Trainees' in Government, Aided & Self-Financing Institutions**

Style	Management Type	N	Mean	Management Type	N	Mean	P Value
Tactile	Government	102	24.00	Aided	116	26.43	0.008*
	Aided	116	26.43	Self-Financing	182	25.71	0.574
	Government	102	24.00	Self-Financing	182	25.71	0.043*

Table-1 indicates that there is a significant difference between teacher trainees studying in government and aided institutions & also between government and self-financing teacher trainees in using their tactile learning style. Hence the null hypothesis-8 is rejected for Tactile learning style.

The mean value of teacher trainees in tactile learning style is greater for those studying in aided institutions than the mean values of those studying in government and self-financing institutions implying that the teacher trainees from aided institutions learn better through tactile learning style than their counterparts from government and self-financing institutions.

### FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. The two most often used language learning strategy of teacher trainees are metacognitive and social strategies with a mean value of 3.746 and 3.322 respectively.
2. The two least often used language learning strategy of teacher trainees are memory and affective strategies with a mean value of 2.741 and 2.915 respectively.
3. The two most preferred learning styles of teacher trainees are tactile and visual learning styles with a mean value of 25.48 and 25.38 respectively.
4. The two least preferred learning styles of teacher trainees are individual and auditory learning styles with a mean value of 23.20 and 24.78 respectively.
5. B.Ed. teacher trainees use more memory, metacognitive, affective and social strategies while D.El.Ed. teacher trainees use more cognitive and compensation strategies than their counterparts.
6. Female D.El.Ed. teacher trainees are better at using memory, cognitive, compensation, affective and social while male teacher trainees are better at using metacognitive strategy.
7. Teacher trainees from rural area use more memory, compensation, metacognitive, and social strategies while teacher trainees from urban area use more of cognitive and affective strategies.
8. Teacher trainees of government institutions use more metacognitive strategy than their counterparts from self-financing and aided institutions.
9. Teacher trainees from aided institutions use more memory, cognitive, compensation, affective and social strategies than those from government and self-financing institutions.
10. B.Ed. teacher trainees prefer visual and individual learning styles while D.El.Ed. teacher trainees prefer auditory, kinesthetic, tactile and group learning styles.
11. Male teacher trainees prefer visual learning style while the female teacher trainees prefer auditory, kinesthetic, tactile, group learning styles.
12. Both male and female teacher trainees prefer individual learning style in learning English as second language as their mean scores are equal.
13. Teacher trainees from rural area prefer visual, auditory, kinesthetic & group learning styles while the urban teacher trainees prefer tactile & individual learning styles.
14. Teacher trainees of self-financing institutions prefer visual learning style than their counterparts from government and aided institutions.
15. Teacher trainees from aided institutions prefer auditory, kinesthetic, tactile and individual learning styles than those from government and self-financing institutions.
16. Teacher trainees from government institutions prefer group learning style than those from aided and self-financing institutions.
17. There is no significant difference between B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. teacher trainees in using language learning

strategies.

18. There is a significant difference between male and female teacher trainees in using cognitive strategy.

19. There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in using language learning strategies.

20. There is a significant difference between teacher trainees studying in aided and self-financing institutions in using their memory strategy.

21. There is also a significant difference between teacher trainees studying in aided and self-financing institutions & government and self-financing institutions in using their affective strategy.

22. There is a significant difference between B.Ed. and D.El.Ed. teacher trainees in the visual, tactile and group learning styles.

23. There is a significant difference between male and female teacher trainees in the auditory, tactile and group learning styles.

24. There is no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in all the learning styles.

25. There is a significant difference between teacher trainees studying in government and aided institutions & also between government and self-financing teacher trainees in using their tactile learning style.

## CONCLUSION

This paper has identified language learning strategies and learning style preferences of teacher trainees in learning English as second language. The results show the most often used language learning strategy and the most preferred learning style of teacher trainees. Good language learners actively involve themselves in the language learning task which is evident from the results. They learn most effectively when the strategy used are closely matched with their preferred learning style. If the learners learning strategies and styles are understood, teaching procedures could be developed for optimal use of the learners' way of learning English as second language.

## REFERENCES

- O'Malley, J. Michael & Anna Uhl Chamot. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Shanthi, R.S. (2009). Unconscious Competency in Learning English as a Second Language. *Journal of Teaching English Language*, 28(6).
- Ellis, Rod. (1993). Talking Shop: Second Language Acquisition Research: How does it help Teacher? An Interview with Rod Ellis. *ELT Journal*, 47/1.
- Felder, R. (1995). Learning and Teaching Styles in Foreign and Second Language Education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(1), 21-31.
- Karthigeyan, K. & Nirmala, K. (2013). Second Language Aptitude of Higher Secondary Level Students - A Preliminary Survey. *Educationia Confab*, 2/1.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the source of Learning and Development*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Retrieved from <https://academic.regis.edu/ed205/kolb.pdf>
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House/Harper & Row.
- Reid, M. J. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21:87-111.
- Rigney, J. W. (1978). Learning strategies: A theoretical perspective. In H.F. O'Neil, Jr. (Ed.), "Learning Strategies," pp.164-205. New York: Academic Press.
- [www.learningstrategies.com](http://www.learningstrategies.com)

# Publish Research Article

## International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Books Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

### Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ Directory Of Research Journal Indexing
- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium Scientific
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

### Associated and Indexed, USA

- DOAJ
- EBSCO
- Crossref DOI
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database

Review Of Research Journal  
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-  
413005, Maharashtra  
Contact-9595359435

E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com