



Archiving Self-Access: Methodological considerations

John Adamson, Howard Brown and Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson

University of Niigata Prefecture, Japan

Bio Data:

John Adamson received his Doctorate of Education from Leicester University. He teaches English for Academic Purposes at the University of Niigata Prefecture in Japan. His research has focused on interview discourse, learning strategies, Teacher Development, and Business English methodology. His current interest is in the area of ‘interdisciplinarity’.

Howard Brown is an assistant professor at the University of Niigata Prefecture in Japan. His teaching interests are in English for Academic Purposes and Content Based Instruction. His current research interests include issues in self access and Content and Language Integrated Learning. He is also involved in faculty development.

Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson is currently completing her Ed.D. thesis from Leicester University, U.K., on team-teaching in Japanese junior high schools. She works at the Self-Access Learning Center (SALC) in University of Niigata Prefecture. Her research interests are in the fields of team-teaching, and the history of ELT in Japan.

Abstract

This study has illustrated how a long-term ethnographic approach of archiving data and profiling its key participants represents an effective means of revealing

perceptions of a new Self-Access Learning Center (SALC) within a university in Japan. This on-going process of conducting qualitative interviews and conversational narratives with center staff, accompanied by student questionnaires, has required methodological reduction of the large amount of ensuing data. Such a process is achieved by a combination of crystallization of themes emerging from dialogues, and analysis of questionnaire data from various perspectives. This methodology reflects the researchers' wishes to investigate the self-access center where they work in a manner more locally situated, co-constructive and, importantly, in one which accords voice and agency to peripheral SALC stakeholders. As a study for the purpose of the continuous improvement of practice, the triangulated methodology employed to gather and analyze data can be adopted by other self-access centers seeking a rich, diverse body of evidence and an analytical framework to respond to the pedagogical and institutional environment where they operate.

Keywords: Self-Access Learning, Methodology, Ethnography, Archive

Introduction

By investigating the growth of a self-access learning center (SALC) in a Japanese university, we as center staff and committee members seek to illustrate in this study the ethnographic methodology implemented over a 2-year period from 2009 to 2010. The methodological stance is that longitudinal, qualitative research undertaken by three central figures in the running of the center and involving various stakeholders represents an effective means to investigate and understand shifting views of self-access and institutional conditions surrounding the center.

We start the study with an overview of the context in which SALC was established

and profiles of the stakeholders using and managing the center. Following this, the methodological approach in the creation of a triangulated ‘archive’ of data is outlined. In keeping with the centrality of ethnographic principles in the research process, we then critically describe the methodology itself. Thereafter, selected archived findings are presented in order to illustrate the importance of using ethnographic techniques to understand diversity and shift over time of themes central to a growing SALC. Finally, we state conclusions and implications for the methodological approach.

Context of the research

The context of this study focuses on the history of SALC, the institution, and the stakeholders – the committee created to direct the center’s operation, students who use it, university management, and non-institutional bodies at the regional and central governmental levels. As both committee members and researchers, we believe that this rich description provides a means to understand more clearly the total “ecological microsystem” (Creese & Martin, 2008) surrounding SALC.

The university was established in April 2009 and was previously a two-year college with courses in various fields, including English Studies. Upon becoming a university, fields were expanded and English Studies was removed from the curriculum. Instead, English was announced as the intended medium of instruction for many content courses, hence requiring a full first year of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) instruction to 160 students in International Studies and Regional Development (ISRD), and 80 students in Human Life Studies (HLS – including nutrition studies and a pre-school teacher’s course). The EAP programme offers students instruction in reading, writing, speaking, and lecture listening and note-taking. SALC was established in April 2009 as part of the change to university status and a SALC Committee was immediately set up to direct its operation. The committee meets every

few months and has 13 members, the largest in the university, the majority of which are English language instructors and SALC mentors. Three part-time mentors staff the center in shifts from 9am to 6pm Monday to Friday. Their role is to maintain the center and provide advice to students on language learning strategies, resources and events in the center.

SALC itself is a large hall with 10 internet-linked computers, a reception, tables, chairs, a sofa and a carpet area. It has full graded reader collections (including audio book CDs) from most major publishers, DVDs, grammar reference materials, games, and a large number of paperbacks and reference materials linked to subjects taught on the ISRD and HLS curricula. Some Chinese, Korean and Russian self-study materials are also available as those languages are also offered as options from the 2nd year. Self-study sites are also bookmarked on the computers for English and Chinese studies.

SALC's day-to-day operations are funded by the university, which is a regional government institution, and budgets have been allocated for its materials from the university itself and the central Japanese government (the Ministry of Education). Furniture and other infrastructure expenses are funded directly by the regional government.

Use of SALC English materials (graded readers and audio CDs) is integrated with the EAP curriculum as taught by six expatriate teachers. Of the six Japanese teachers of English, one has integrated his syllabus with SALC materials usage. No integration with content teachers in the ISRD and HLS faculties has been made. As EAP is obligatory for first year students, requiring up to 16 hours per week of study, the vast majority of visitors are freshmen. Second year students are only required to take five credits of English classes a year, most of which are taught by Japanese faculty

members, so considerably fewer sophomores use the center for English self-study, although students taking Chinese, Korean and Russian do visit to borrow self-study materials in those languages. Use of self-study materials for those languages has not been linked to evaluation in the corresponding syllabi.

There are various other ways in which the center has been integrated with the EAP programme taught by expatriate teachers. Workshops are held with a view to focus on areas which the mentors and teachers feel represent deficits in students' competencies, for example, process writing. In an attempt to involve teachers of other languages and subjects in SALC, mini lectures are given by some of those teachers who are willing and able to introduce their subject areas and their experiences of learning English. These lectures have been well-attended and popular.

In this study, an archive of one-to-one semi-structured interviews, informal group "conversational narratives" (CNs) (Ochs & Capps, 2001, p.3) and questionnaire findings has been compiled. We have adopted this mixture of methods in consideration of our dual role as practitioners and researchers, two stances which inform each other and benefit from multiple perspectives of SALC usage, both in terms of accessing a wide range of participant voices, and also allowing those participants various means to express their voices. This process is one which firstly regards narratives and our own experiences as valid forms of data in that they provide insightful evidence for research purposes (Sperber & Wilson, 1995). Additionally, our method of data collection reflects and enriches the democratic practice of the SALC committee in which co-construction of ideas through dialogue is considered professional practice in its own right.

Every few months the researchers have met to discuss SALC's progress in the one-to-one interviews and group CNs, all of which have been recorded and summarized.

These participants have pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. To aid the reader in understanding the role of participants as a key part of the context of this ethnographic study, and their profiles are given in brief below.

Participant profiles

Peter: Peter has been the head of the SALC Committee since its opening and reports to Mr. Tanaka. He has experience in setting up small extensive reading self-access centers (in Japan), medium-sized self-access centers (in Thailand) and has visited other centers in Europe and Asia. As committee head, his role is to co-ordinate the SALC operation, particularly with regard to budgets allocated to the center. He is a doctor in his late-40s, a UK national and is keen on ethnographic, qualitative research.

Paul: Paul is a committee member and has experience teaching in Turkey and Japan. He has set up small, non-staffed self-access centers in other universities and is familiar with computerized systems of monitoring student self-study. He is a Canadian national, qualified with an MA and is in his early 40s. He is interested in perceptions of self-access and the role of mentors.

Lee: Lee is a committee member from Singapore with various experiences of self-access in Japan and Singapore. He is a strong advocate of extensive reading and learner autonomy. He is a doctor in his early 40s. He conducts research in the field of language policy and is responsible for SALC promotion.

Sayaka: Sayaka, a Japanese graduate of the institution when it was a college and in her early 20s, worked for one year as a mentor in SALC before moving on to a full-time teaching position elsewhere. She graduated from an American university (an undergraduate degree in second language acquisition), but had little teaching experience before becoming a mentor. She was instrumental in setting up and

promoting the center.

Keiko: Keiko has been a mentor in SALC since its opening and is seen as the ‘senior’ mentor. She is Japanese, in her early 40s and has extensive experience teaching English at junior high schools in Japan. She has an MA from a UK university and is studying for a doctorate. She has experience using self-access in large UK universities and also helped set up a small extensive reading center in a Japanese college before becoming a mentor. Her specific role in SALC is to manage the day-to-day budget for the mentors’ administrative needs and make orders for resources.

Simon: Simon is a young American mentor who joined SALC in its second year of operation. He recently graduated from a university in America, but was brought up in Japan. He is multilingual (bilingual in English and Japanese) and also speaks some Chinese. He takes care of the computer systems in SALC and is responsible for coordination between teachers of Chinese, Korean and Russian and SALC.

Rika: Rika also joined SALC as a mentor in its second year. She recently came back from university in Canada where she graduated with a BA and has a teaching certificate in TESOL. She organizes SALC events and is responsible for coordinating the duties of SALC student assistants.

Mr. Tanaka: Mr. Tanaka is the administrative manager of SALC and is a regional government official working at the university. He is head of the mentors but does not manage their day-to-day activities, preferring to leave that to the SALC committee to determine. His role as manager is to allocate budgets and evaluate the center to report to the university management, regional government administration and Ministry of Education. With an MBA from an English-medium university in Japan, he speaks English well and is a strong advocate of self-access in the university.

With this contextualization of SALC and its participants, we now turn to the

methodological approach employed in this study.

Methodology

The triangulated methodology draws upon an archive of one-to-one interviews and group “conversational narratives” (CNs) (Ochs & Capps, 2001, p.3) with various SALC stakeholders (committee members and management), along with a large body of findings from questionnaires completed by students (see Appendix 1 for the questionnaire). Among the committee members involved in the study, all were encouraged to keep journals to record their feelings about SALC over time, especially to note any critical incidents affecting their views and to use in interviews or CNs. The concept of CN was used when the group met to discuss issues as the agenda was not pre-determined. For one-to-one interviews, themes were negotiated beforehand so that preparation could be made, for example, by recalling notes kept in the participants’ journals. The schedule of data collected is illustrated chronologically in table 1.

Time/Method	Participants	Theme
1. 1 st November/ CN	4 Committee members (CM)	Mentors
2. 2 nd November/CN	5 Committee members	Half-year review
3. February/Questionnaire	1 st year students	SALC use in first year
4. March/CN	4 Committee members	Questionnaire /year review
5. April/Interview	1 CM & office manger	Images/management
6. May/CN	3 Committee members	First year review
7. 1 st June/Interview	1 mentor	Images/curriculum/improvement
8. 2 nd June/Interview	1 mentor	Images/curriculum/improvement

Table 1: Schedule of data collection

This represents the archive of CNs, interviews and a questionnaire over the 2009-2010 period. The data is qualitative and involves much reflection on SALC’s progress and future directions within the interviews and CNs. In this sense, we see some

resonance to studies into autonomous learning in Finland by Kjisik (2007 in Gardner ed.) in which an action research approach was adopted and in Hong Kong by Morrison (2008) in which the voices of a range of stakeholders was regarded as important. The process in this study of creating an archive of data is epistemologically ethnographic in that it focuses on the position of a SALC within a larger university community and on its participants over time. It also places the process of understanding shifting contexts and critical views towards SALC at the center of the researchers' considerations. Blommaert and Jie (2010, p. 10) see this process as the "product" of ethnographic research since the archive "documents the researcher's own journey through knowledge".

Interviews and conversational narratives

As a large amount of recorded data was collected for the archive, data reduction was necessary. In the analysis of CNs and interviews, a three-stage process of data reduction was carried out based on an adapted "phenomenological reduction" (Hycner, 1985; Kvale, 1996). In the first stage, it was noted from the audio recordings what views were expressed (and by whom) for each topic under discussion, whether relevant to the topic or not. New themes that had not originally been predetermined were also added to the list of topics. For the second stage of reduction, "natural meaning units" or "central themes" (Kvale 1996, p. 195) were identified which were directly relevant to the topics, termed by Hycner (1985, as cited in Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 294) as "crystallizing" each theme's meaning, and included eliminating irrelevant data. After "crystallization" was completed for each interview, a final stage of analysis compared and contrasted the views expressed across interviews and between participants to ascertain what shifts in opinions had occurred over time.

Interviews were based upon a loose, semi-structured schedule of themes conveyed to all participants beforehand, but were also open to both participants' topic extensions and deviations (Drever, 1995). In this sense, all interviews were thematically open to negotiation and "co-constructed" (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995, p. 171) between participants. Holstein and Gubrium (1995) see this as "active" interviewing (p. 114). In reality, the open-ended nature of the interviews and frequent deviation from any predetermined themes resulted in long interviews which more resembled the group CNs in which participants encouraged each other to jointly build mini narratives without a strict, pre-determined agenda. The interviews and CNs attempted to explore and extend themes in a reflexive manner between participants. These themes were often indexed to unrecorded and spontaneous conversations which arose on a day-to-day basis out of participants' readings and critical incidents. We believed the creation of rapport was essential to achieve this joint meaning-making and so aligned the interviews and CNs with Alvesson's (2003) and Roulston's (2010, p. 217) "romantic conception of interviewing" where themes are drawn out in the form of mini narratives. Additionally, the process of participation in both interviews and CNs could be seen as beneficial for personal development and "transformative" (Roulston, 2010, p. 220) in that, through the dialogic process, ideas and assumptions about self-access were frequently challenged, and new insights were formed during the discussions themselves, rather than pre-determined ideas simply being reported. Baker and Johnson (1998, p. 241) actually see such interaction as "situated professional practice" in its own right, since it creates a healthy opportunity to "share moral ground" (Baker & Johnson, 1998, p. 231), create rapport and share stories related to practice (Ellis & Berger, 2003). In effect, the discourse emanating from interviews and CNs formed two "cartographies of communicability" (Briggs, 2007 as

cited in Talmy, 2010, p.130) which conceptualize how the interactions can be viewed as “social practice” (stakeholders meeting to talk about SALC as collegial, collaborative meaning making) and as “research instruments” (methods in which data can be generated) (Talmy, 2010, p. 129). All one-to-one interviews and CNs were audio recorded in SALC itself or at a conference venue.

Questionnaires

At the end of the first academic year we gave out questionnaires to all university students who had access to SALC. The two fields of study, ISRD (International Studies and Regional Development) and HLS (Human Life Studies) had various levels of classes, as shown in table 2. Institutional consent was granted and the objectives of the study were explained to the students by all class teachers. Some teachers allocated class time to complete the questionnaire, whilst others chose to allow students to complete it in their free time. Of the 240 students enrolled in ISRD and HLS, 180 students were available for the study, among which 114 returned their questionnaires, representing a 63% return rate.

	Basic	Intermediate	Advanced
HLS 80 students	1 class: 18 returns	2 classes: 39 returns	no classes taught
ISRD 160 students	1 class: 17 returns	3 classes: 27 returns	1 class: 13 returns

Table 2: Questionnaire returns

The questionnaire was devised in consultation between mentors and teachers working for the SALC committee and comprised ten questions on six areas of enquiry as represented in table 3:

Views of SALC (room and materials):	Questions 1 -3
Views of mentors:	Questions 4- 5
Reasons for using SALC and personal use:	Questions 6- 7

Teacher engagement with SALC:	Question 8
Metaphors of SALC:	Question 9
Suggestions for improvement:	Questions 10

Table 3: Questionnaire themes

There were two final sections for open-ended responses; one asking students to add a question that they feel should have been asked and answer it, and the other inviting students to write any free comments. A mixture of open-ended and closed questions was used which were qualitatively analyzed. We invited students to complete the questionnaires anonymously in either English or Japanese and informed them that there was no obligation to participate in the study.

The questionnaire data from the 114 students was in paper form and collected from class teachers in the last two weeks of the first year of study. Analysis of returns was conducted in Japanese by Japanese speakers and in English by a native English speaker. This involved identification of the most or least commonly-occurring words or phrases such as ‘informative’, ‘kind’, ‘helpful’ or ‘good’. In questions for which responses could be counted, numbers were totaled for classes, levels and fields but then brought together to constitute generalizations such as ‘most students at the basic levels in the HLS field’ or ‘some students’, ‘a few students’ or ‘one student’. It was thought among the researchers that data quantitatively analyzed to produce findings represented in detailed percentages would be less informative or meaningful to us.

Following the basic concept of data reduction (Miles & Huberman, 1984), the analytical framework for this questionnaire data was formulated to meet local needs of revealing student perceptions of SALC at multiple levels. The returns were analyzed according to the following scheme of data reduction in four stages:

Stage 1: Individual class analysis

Returns were analyzed from the eight classes revealing patterns (most common

responses) and idiosyncrasies (least common but informative responses) within classes.

Stage 2: Level analysis for two fields

Findings from each level were compiled in separate fields, ISRD (Basic, Intermediate and Advanced) and HLS (Basic and Advanced). At this stage, patterns started to emerge at different levels.

Stage 3: Combining levels across the fields

Findings from the three levels were then combined across the HLS and ISRD (with the exception of the advanced level which existed for the ISRD faculty only). This revealed some commonalities across the two fields, yet care was taken to note important differences between the fields if they occurred.

Stage 4: Revisiting the individual classes

To make sure that important results had not been missed in the subsequent stages of findings, individual class returns were then redistributed among the researchers, each receiving a set of returns that they had not originally analyzed. This enabled us to make the analysis more reliable in that initially missed, yet potentially informative; responses could then be reintegrated in the findings at stages 2 and 3 respectively. In fact, some insightful findings were successfully reintegrated in this manner.

The four stages adopted in this data reduction scheme provide multi-perspectives on the same body of data: from the individual class, individual fields, and levels of classes across the fields. These perspectives serve not simply to inform the researchers educationally, but also equip us in appropriate dissemination of the findings to the various stakeholders in the university and beyond who need different types of detail on SALC's effectiveness.

Archived findings

The methodological approach in this study leads to the formulation of data which needs to be interpreted within the context and setting. For the purpose of this study, selected findings from only one major theme within the archives are given to illustrate the diverse and shifting nature of opinions. They are presented in a variety of forms which constitute the ethnographic procedure: key group conversational narrative (CN) findings in their same conversational format to reflect the co-constructed nature of many decisions: interview and questionnaire findings in summarised form. Participant pseudonyms and positions as described in their participant profiles earlier are given in brief in table 4 below.

Peter	Committee head (UK, English teacher)
Paul	Committee member (Canada, English teacher)
Lee	Committee member (Singapore, English teacher)
Sayaka	Committee member (Japanese mentor for one year in 2009)
Keiko	Committee member (Japanese mentor from 2009 to present)
Simon	Committee member (American mentor from 2010 to present)
Rika	Committee member (Japanese mentor from 2010 to present)
Mr. Tanaka	SALC manager (Japanese regional government/ university staff)

Table 4: Participants

An example of one theme emerging over the period 2009 to 2010 was that of language policy for SALC. Below key findings from the archives are presented chronologically and are followed by a discussion which both summarises the opinions expressed and links them to key literature in the field.

Language policy

2nd November, 2009: CN - extract

Lee: One committee member suggested strict guidelines on language policy, even asking students to leave SALC if they speak Japanese. Many felt this to be too strict since most students come from non-English speaking school environments.

Keiko: I was one of the objectors to this proposal as my experience of language center use in the UK was one of flexibility in code switching.

Lee: Initially our policies were based on a view of one homogenous student group. However, the diversity among them is fairly wide as we have groups of students doing different programmes. There was also diversity as how faculty members perceived the students.

February, 2010: student questionnaire - summary

Some students' feedback stated that the loose language policy should be more strictly enforced as many students appeared to make little effort to practise English in the center.

May, 2010: CN with mentors and other committee members - summary

Keiko reaffirmed her image of self-access as one influenced by her own experiences in UK universities which employed multilingual mentors. This made those centers the scenes of linguistic code-switching, rather than of the strict monolingual language policies in other self-access centers. Peter and Keiko referred to this as "translanguaging" where the ability to switch languages between L1 and L2 is regarded as a linguistic competence in its own right because the L1 is valued, not censored.

June, 2010: Interview with a new mentor, Simon - summary

Simon encouraged students to use English, but would not ban Japanese. He felt code-switching was linguistically beneficial for both students and himself when giving advice. More important than a strict 'English only' policy was the "cost/benefit" idea (persuading students that they should think of the costs of their study to get as much benefit as possible).

June, 2010: Interview with a new mentor, Rika - summary

Rika was unsure how strict a language policy should be enforced and felt that a positive “cool” “knock-on effect” occurs when students speak English in the vicinity of less confident students.

Discussion of language policy

Archive findings appear to show that the initial ‘English only’ policy has been superseded by the realization that some use of the students’ L1 is beneficial when talking about language. This “translanguaging” (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 105) suggests that code-switching is recognized as a third competence (after competence in L1 and L2) among mentors and committee members. However, there remains the important issue of how students themselves regard use of the L1 as some findings illustrate objections to a loose language policy. “Parallel monolingualism” (Heller, 1998) or the “two solitudes” (Cummins, 2005, 2008) approach to language acquisition would appear to be more embedded in student beliefs about language learning than among committee members. The new mentor’s (Rika) comments about making English usage “cool” among student peer groups, coupled with the other new mentor’s (Simon) policy of reminding students of the “cost/benefit” of using as much English as possible both represent perhaps a more persuasive approach of achieving more English use in the center. Although, in principle, code-switching is seen by committee members as a valid ‘third competence’, feelings of resistance to L1 use, “guilt” (Setati et al, 2002, p. 147) and lack of awareness of translanguaging as a bone fide skill remain possible obstacles to the multilingual space as envisaged by the elder mentor, Keiko.

Conclusions and Implications

The purpose of this study has been to represent the methodological approach so as to inform researchers involved in developing a new self-access learning center in a university context. The longitudinal and qualitative process employed is ethnographic in nature as it regards context as central and ever-shifting. Static approaches to assessing a center's performance are rejected in this study since they do not account for such longitudinal changes. Instead, the diversity of views is better represented by carefully collected archives of discussions (semi-structured interviews and CNs), and questionnaire data representing views of a range of stakeholders who impact the center's development.

We have argued that within the process of gathering data, particularly in the semi-structured interviews and CNs, various purposes can be cited for talking with stakeholders. One is to gain access to opinions and beliefs over time to create a body of data, meaning that the discussions themselves are "research instruments" (Talmy, 2010, p. 129); the other is to create sites of "social practice" (Talmy, 2010, p. 129) in which participants co-construct beliefs through mini narratives in a collegial manner. This represents a form of professional development at the workplace which can be regarded as empowering for participants who may normally feel excluded, or marginalized in the organization at large.

The archives in this ethnographic approach have been presented in chronological format for the purpose of illustrating potential shifts of views over time as well as how participants express a diversity of opinions. This representation is an important exercise for the SALC committee to engage in regularly so that the archive itself is constantly being reviewed, revisited and challenged. Findings themselves are localised to this particular university context, yet the methodology outlined here may serve as a useful basis for other self-access centers in monitoring growth over time.

Implications for this study suggest that an expansion of methods may benefit the effectiveness of the archives. A greater emphasis on autoethnographic journal keeping can provide more individual records for public use in the archives, rather than private use alone. Importantly, as the center operates within a larger university organization which is itself overseen financially and evaluated by regional and national governments, access to stakeholder voices outside of the committee and student body can provide wider perspectives on how the center is positioned and viewed. As internal evaluation by the committee has adopted this current ethnographic stance, the possibly more financially-oriented, quantitative evaluation criteria of the university management, regional and national governments also need to be taken into account to supplement the qualitative criteria of the committee.

References

- Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond Neopositivists, Romantics, and Localists: A Reflexive Approach to Interviews in Organizational Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 13-33.
- Baker, C. D. & Johnson, G. (1998). Interview talk as professional practice. *Language and Education*, 12(4), 229 – 242.
- Blommaert, J. & Jie, D. (2010). *Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Briggs, C. (2007). Anthropology, interviewing, and communicability in contemporary society. *Current Anthropology*, 48, 551-567.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103-115.

- Creese, A. & Martin, P. (2008). Classroom ecologies: A case study from a Gujarati complementary school in England. In Creese, A., Martin, P., & Hornberger, N. H., (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 9: Ecology of Language* (2nd ed., pp. 263-272). Boston: Springer + Science Business Media.
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competencies as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 585-592.
- Drever, E. (1995). *Using semi-structured interviews in small-scale research*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Ellis, C. & Berger, L. (2003). Their Story/My Story/Our Story: Including the Researcher's Experience in Interview Research. In Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (Eds.) *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns*. (pp. 467-493), Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Gardner, D. & Miller, L. (1999). *Establishing Self-Access*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The Active Interview*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Hycner, R. M. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies*, 8, 279-303.
- Jacoby, J. and Ochs, E. (1995). Co-construction: An Introduction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 28 (3), 171 – 183.
- Kjisik, F. (2007). Ten years in autonomy: reflections and research on the ALMS programme. In Gardner, D. (Ed.). *Learner Autonomy: 10 Integration and Support*.

- (pp. 113-126). Dublin: Authentik.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Morrison, B. (2008). The role of the self-access centre in the tertiary language learning process. *System*, 36, 123-140.
- Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (2001). *Living Narrative*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Roulston, K. (2010). Considering Quality in Qualitative Interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 199-228.
- Setati, M., Adler, J., Reed, Y., & Bapoo, A. (2002). Incomplete journeys: Code-switching and other language practices in mathematics, science and English language classrooms in South Africa. *Language and Education*, 16, 128-149.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: communication and cognition*. (2nd ed.) Oxford: Blackwell.
- Talmy S. (2010). Qualitative Interviews in Applied Linguistics: From Research Instrument to Social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128-148.

Appendix 1: English questionnaire

1.What do you think of SALC?

- The room? (Space, enough seats ..)
- The posters (interesting? Informative?)

2.What do you think of the resources in SALC?

- Books/CDs/DVDs?
- PCs , DVD players?
- Games,?
- Grammar materials, testing materials etc?

- Magazines?

3.What do you think of the activities/events?

- With teachers (including the lecture series)
- Workshops
- Festivals/celebrations
- Movie nights

4.Did you ask the mentors for advice? (Yes/No)

If yes, what did you often ask?

If no, why not?

5.How was the advice from mentors?

- About how to use SALC
- About language and language learning

6.Why did you go to SALC? (Mark O as many times as you wish)

- My teacher told me ()
- SALC is a good place to study ()
- SALC is comfortable ()
- SALC is a good social place ()
- Other reasons:

7. How about your use?

- How easy or difficult is it to use SALC?
- How often do you visit SALC per week? (Mark O)
 1. Once a week ()
 2. A few times a week ()
 3. A few times a month ()
 4. A few times a semester ()
 5. Never ()
- How long do you spend each visit? (Mark O)
 1. Less than 10 minutes ()
 2. 11 – 30 minutes ()
 3. 31 – 60 minutes ()
 4. More than 60 minutes ()

- What do you usually use SALC for? (Mark O)
 1. Lecture activity? ()
 2. ER/EL? ()
 3. Games? ()
 4. Grammar? ()
 5. Testing preparation? ()
 6. Events? ()
 7. Talk with friends? ()
 8. To pick up materials to study at home? ()
 9. Group projects? ()
 10. Watch DVDs? ()

- Do you study by yourself or with friends?

8. How about your teachers?

- Do they encourage you to use SALC? (Yes/No)
- Do they encourage you to study independently? (Yes/No)
- Is SALC integrated with classes? (Mark O)
 - No ()
 - A little ()
 - Enough ()
 - Too much ()

9. How do you see SALC? As a.... (Mark O as many times as you wish)

- Self-study center? ()
- Homework center? ()
- Place to meet friends? ()
- Library? ()
- Another CALL? ()
- Advice center? ()
- Another ?

10. Suggestions for improvement:

- More materials? Which?
- More technology? Which?
- More events/activities? Which?
- Other suggestions?

11. What question(s) did we forget to ask you? If you have a question, please answer it.

Question(s)

Answer(s)

Other comments: