

A Needs Analysis Approach to the Evaluation of Iranian Third-Grade High School English Textbook

SAGE Open
July-September 2014: 1–9
© The Author(s) 2014
DOI: 10.1177/2158244014551709
sgo.sagepub.com


Nasser Rashidi¹ and Roghaye Kehtarfard¹

Abstract

Needs analysis as an integral part of evaluative review of English materials, mainly textbooks, requires giving sufficient attention in all English language learning contexts. This issue seems to be more demanding in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts where the textbooks are the main sources of input for the learners. However, in some cases, this important factor is excluded entirely or at least limited to the ideas of major stakeholders. This article reports on the findings of a study conducted to evaluate an English textbook (the third-grade high school English book), which is being used in all state high schools in Iran by using a needs analysis framework. First, the needs analysis questionnaires were administered among 180 third-grade female high school students for whom the textbook was designed. Having investigated the students' perceived foreign language needs, the researcher then used it as the basis for evaluating the textbook. The results of the textbook evaluation revealed that although all language skills and components were almost important for the majority of the students, the textbook could not fully support all of them together. Finally, it was suggested that the textbook be revised or at least supplemented by other instructional materials, so that it could be more effective for the aforementioned learners.

Keywords

needs analysis, language learners, English materials, evaluation, review, textbook revision, supplementation

Introduction

Needs analysis began to be used in language programs during the 1960s when English for Specific Purposes (ESP) instruction attracted the practitioners' attention (Richards, 2001). From then on, the term has been defined and implemented differently by different people (e.g., Brindley, 1989; Brown, 1995; Richards, 2002). Today, needs analysis is not limited to ESP courses; its inclusion can be seen in various curriculum development and reviews. In general, successful educational programs have needs analysis as a critical part of their syllabuses. In these programs, needs are identified and continually examined to ensure that they remain the learners' true needs. Among the constituents of English Language Teaching (ELT) programs, textbooks have been viewed as the main resources in achieving aims and objectives that have already been set in terms of learners' needs (Litz, 2001). As such, designing or selecting appropriate textbooks, reviewing, evaluating, and adapting them continually in response to evolving learners' needs are what should be included in almost all language programs (e.g., Litz, 2001; Stoller, Horn, Grabe, & Robinson, 2006).

Literature Review

Theoretical Perspectives on Needs Analysis

The significance of needs analysis has led to the development of different approaches for implementing it in actual curriculum development and review. Munby was the pioneer in this respect who paved the way for other theorists. He proposed his sociolinguistic model to update and improve ESP courses during the 1960s and 1970s. His model comprised of two stages. The first stage was identifying the communication needs of the learners, and the second stage was integrating the derived needs in the form of micro-skills and micro-functions into the curriculum design. Although Munby's (1978) work was very comprehensive, its

¹Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran

Corresponding Author:

Nasser Rashidi, College of Literature and Humanities, Shiraz University, Shiraz 7194684795, Iran.
Email: nrashidi@rose.shirazu.ac.ir



impracticality, inflexibility, and complexity gave rise to some criticism (Ha, 2005).

Following that, several alternative influential approaches to needs analysis were proposed including a systemic approach (Richerich & Chancerel, 1977), a learning-centered approach (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987), a learner-centered approach (Berwick, 1989; Brindley, 1989), and a task-based approach (Long, 2005) among some others. The systemic approach was more flexible and practical in comparison with Munby's work. However, it suffered from the weak point that the approach was too dependent on the learners' perceptions of their needs rather than their actual real-world needs. Learning-centered approach was also offered as a reaction to Munby's work. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) believed that Munby paid much attention to language needs, whereas more attention had to be given to how learners learn. They instead talked about two kinds of needs: target needs versus learning needs, simply defined as what the learner desires to do in the target situation and the existing individual factors that affect the identified needs, respectively.

Berwick (1989) and Brindley (1989) were two pioneers in learner-centered approaches to needs analysis. They looked at learners' needs from different angles and thought that learners' needs in general could be figured out in three ways: perceived versus felt needs, product- versus process-oriented interpretations, and objective versus subjective needs. Perceived needs were identified from the experts' perspective, whereas felt needs were specified from the learners' perspective. Learners' needs in the product-oriented interpretation were viewed as the language the learners needed in the target situation, whereas in process-oriented interpretation, the focus was on how the learners dealt with the target situation (e.g., cognitive and affective variables). And finally, objective needs were explored before starting a course, while subjective needs were dealt with throughout the course. Following that, Long (2005) recommended a task-based approach to needs analysis. In this approach, tasks were the units of analysis. Samples of the discourse typically involved in the performance of target tasks were collected and then analyzed. These tasks and communicative events were similar to Munby's (1978) model but the main focus in task-based approach was on language variables rather than sociolinguistic ones.

In recent years, needs analysis is seen as one of the most important constituents in several curriculum development and review models (Stoller et al., 2006). In systematic approach, proposed by Brown (1995), the needs analysis phase was one of the five principal components of his curriculum development framework: needs analysis; the specification of goals and objectives; test development and improvement; material adoption, adaptation, and development; and teacher and teaching support. The purpose of the model was to systematically gather information to design the objectives of the curriculum. Richards (2001) also put forward his model of curriculum design, very similar to what

Brown had proposed. The elements were needs analysis, situation analysis, specification of goals and learning products, course planning and syllabus design, and teaching. There are also other frameworks that have not been so famous. Such theoretical models were proposed in specific contexts where it was thought that the available ones could not grant the purposes. In fact, the latest frameworks have tried to identify the learners' needs through a more critical analysis, including all cultural, societal, and probably motivational factors. In Kaewpet's (2008) framework, which falls in this category, the learners' needs are specified both before planning the course and while the course is underway to see whether the needs have been met.

Various writers (Aguilar, 1999; Holme & Chaluisaeng, 2006; Weddel & Duzer, 1997) have correspondingly tried to express the fundamental role of learners' perceptions of their language learning needs among other factors.

Empirical Studies on Needs Analysis

There are also empirical studies that have made needs analysis more salient in real teaching and learning situations. In his research, Oanh (2007) evaluating two ESP programs maintained that the needs analysis studies that consider learners as the source data were more beneficial in planning ELT programs. In addition, Mazdayasna and Tahririan's (2008) study revealed that the "students' needs" were one very important factor that if not considered could bring about failure in different respects. Later, Kaewpet (2009) attempted to modify a curriculum in a way to meet the needs in the actual teaching and learning context. In another attempt, Bosuwon and Woodrow's (2009) study that was carried out before the courses designed to see if the courses are in line with the perceived needs showed that as the courses could address the students' needs they would be successful in future. In a more recent attempt, Akyela and Ozeka (2010), Chostelidoua (2010), and Kandil (n.d.) in their studies using triangulation research methods attempted to reach a balance between theories and practice of identifying learners' needs.

Needs Analysis and the Curriculum

Based on what mentioned, it can be said that the demand of having a highly specific ESP language course for each group of learners with a clear focus on their special perceived needs has to be at the center of all language programs and in all language learning contexts. Here, the question is "how needs analysis can be inserted into the curriculum?" One possible answer would be "textbooks." In other words, textbooks as the heart of ELT programs (Sheldon, 1988) are where these claims can be successfully accomplished. Several writers (e.g., Cunningsworth, 1995; Haycroft, 1998; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994; O'Neill, 1982; Riazi, 2003) have agreed upon the essential and positive role of textbooks in English as a second language (ESL)/English as a foreign language (EFL)

classrooms. According to Riazi (2003, as cited in Razmjoo, 2007), “textbooks play a very crucial role in the realm of language teaching and learning and are considered the next important factor (*element*) [emphasis added] in the second/foreign language classroom after the teacher” (p. 52). Cunningsworth (1995) argued that textbooks are effective resources for self-directed learning and presentation material, sources of ideas and activities, reference sources for students, syllabuses where they reflect pre-determined learning objectives, and support for less experienced teachers who have yet to gain in confidence. These researchers have also asserted that the acceptance and appropriateness of textbooks are much dependent on satisfying the learners’ needs. As stated by Cunningsworth (1995), good textbooks should closely reflect the learners’ needs.

O’Neill (1982) maintained that textbooks’ efficiency is very sensitive to students’ needs. Brown (1995) also pointed out that textbooks should be at the service of the teachers and students. He then stated that every effort should be made to find a wide variety of contextually relevant criteria for the evaluation of textbooks. Acknowledging these points, several scholars have brought textbook evaluation to the center of their attention, and several standardized evaluation checklists have been designed and prepared for the purpose (e.g., Brown, 1995; Cunningsworth, 1995; Harmer, 1996; Sheldon, 1988; Williams, 1983). Although they may be different on the surface, they contain similar components that can be used as helpful starting points for ELT practitioners in a wide variety of situations. The proposed criteria include assessing a textbook’s methodology, aims, approaches, and the degree to which a material is not only teachable but also fits the needs of the individual teacher’s approach as well as the organization’s overall curriculum. More important, Cunningsworth (1995) and Ellis (1997) suggested three types of material evaluation. The first type is the “predictive” or “pre-use” evaluation that is designed to examine the future or potential performance of a textbook. The second type is “in-use” evaluation that is designed to examine material that is currently being used. The third type is the “retrospective” or “post-use” evaluation of a textbook that has been used in any specific institution or situation.

Hence, constant evaluation of textbooks to check whether they are appropriate is of great importance. In addition, adopting a needs analysis approach, among other factors, can be seen incumbent in the process. It can be said that getting ideas and feedback from teacher and student users is helpful as materials writers cannot always predict what others may find problematic with their materials (see Stoller et al., 2006). There are a great number of studies on textbook evaluation with their focus on different criteria, concerns, and priorities (e.g., Al-Madany, 2009; Hashim, 2003; Litz, 2001; Wan-jane & Yu-Chih Doris, 2009). Needs analysis can be seen as one of the components of textbooks. This component receives considerable attention in the overall process of textbook development and evaluation.

As regards the present study, different textbook evaluation studies have been carried out in Iran. Those that are related to high school EFL materials are not rare. In one of these attempts, Tavakoli (1995) used Searle’s (1976) model of speech act to analyze dialogues excerpted from three English textbooks, which were used in Iran at high school senior level. Jahangard (2007) evaluated four EFL textbooks that have been taught at Iranian high schools by the Ministry of Education. He scrutinized four EFL textbooks with reference to 13 common criteria extracted from different materials evaluation checklists. Elsewhere, Razmjoo (2007) conducted a study to assess high school and institute English textbooks in Iran. His aim was to show to what extent these textbooks represented Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) features. Moreover, Riazi and Aryashokouh (2007) analyzed four high school and pre-university English textbooks with the main focus on the consciousness-raising aspect of vocabulary exercises. And finally, Riazi and Mosalanejad (2010) investigated the types of learning objectives in Iranian high school and pre-university English textbooks. The evaluation took place with regard to six levels of learning objectives in Bloom’s taxonomy.

Recently, researchers such as Alemi and Sadehvandi (2012); Wen-Cheng, Chien-Hung, and Chung-Chieh (2011); Gholaminia Tabari (2013); Aliakbari and Gheitasi (2014); Rezaee, Kouhpaenejad, and Mohammadi (2013); and Rahimi and Hassani (2012), in their studies, evaluated textbooks regarding the role assigned to the language skills, the benefits of reading texts, the role of material development, and the efficiency of ELT programs in developing the language skills. They further found that the learners’ views are important in choosing appropriate textbooks and also the learners’ attitude toward the textbooks determines their attitude toward the foreign language they learn.

These studies are invaluable in their own right, but none of these studies evaluated the Iranian high school English textbook series from a needs analysis perspective. They might have looked at the students’ needs very indirectly, but there was no clear focus on their evolving real needs.

The Context of the Study

In Iran, students learn EFL. Although there are various language institutes, state schools are the main places where they are exposed to English. Iranian students start studying English in the first grade of guidance school and continue their studies up to pre-university. English language programs for the state schools are planned nationwide by the Ministry of Education. The same English textbooks (with almost the same language and learning patterns) are published, and used by all students throughout the country as the only reliable resource available to the whole population. Some of these textbooks may change a little but others are used for years without any modification. This lack of textbook reviews has cast a doubt on most practitioners as to their suitability for

Table 1. Percentages and Chi-Square Results for Item 1: The Usefulness of Each Skill for Improving the Overall English Ability.

	Reading	Listening	Speaking	Writing	Total	χ^2	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>
<i>n</i>	46	22	98	14	180	95.556	.000	3
%	25.6	12.2	54.4	7.8	100			

Iranian students. To find out if the textbooks currently used possess this suitability, as the first step, the researcher has chosen one of these English textbooks as the representative of the series (the third-grade high school English book).

Being optimistic and accepting the inclusion of needs analysis in designing and developing the textbook, the researcher has decided to assess the appropriateness of the textbook to see if the book adequately meets the students' present needs. Indeed, a number of studies have been carried out on the proposed series, but this study is poles apart as it has just tried to approach the matter differently. The distinctive feature of this piece of research is that, contrary to the prior accomplished efforts, it seeks to be more decisive by incorporating needs analysis more effectively into its design. This study is based on Long's (2005) theoretical framework and dwells on what has been the primary focus of most ESL/EFL evaluation programs, that is, the types of linguistic outputs the students will need in their actual performances. For the practicality purposes, the investigation relies on women's perspective. However, further research is recommended if a course update is to be implemented.

Briefly, the present study aims to reveal the suitability of the third-grade high school English textbook for the intended students. This evaluative review of the English textbook, which is based on needs analysis, serves as an attempt to evaluate the textbook more deeply, while giving some clues and an impetus for the subsequent modifications. It can be followed by other evaluative studies of the available textbooks, so that the inclusion of needs analysis as an ongoing process can be mediated more precisely. More specifically, the study mainly focuses on the following research questions:

Research Question 1: What are the perceived English language needs of the third-grade high school students in Iran?

Research Question 2: Does the textbook (English Book 3 of high school) fulfill these needs?

Method

Instruments

This descriptive and evaluative study is based on an available questionnaire originally prepared by Balint (n.d.). The original questionnaire had 54 items: 40 6-point Likert-type scale items and 14 other items. Based on the objectives of the study, just the last 28 items were chosen (see the appendix). The selected items mainly assessed the students' current and future language learning needs. Except the first item, the

other ones were anchored on a 6-point Likert-type scale. The Persian version was made by translating the items into Persian. The back-translation with subtle differences was then given to a three-member professional team in this field for checking its validity. The reliability was also set by conducting a pilot study consisting of 30 representative students. The coefficient alpha was found to be .94, which was a good index for the purpose.

Participants

The questionnaires were administered among 180 Iranian third-grade female high school students who were mostly between the ages of 16 and 17. They were selected from among the students of three majors (mathematics, empirical sciences, and humanities) with the same proportion—60 students in each major—by using convenience and purposive sampling procedures.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The data were gathered in Shiraz and Kherame's (one of the towns in Fars province) high schools during the students' final-exam period at the end of the academic year 2009-2010. The students were given ample time to answer the items. For their convenience, the questionnaires were answered anonymously. The researcher was present at the site for giving instructions. The data derived from the needs analysis questionnaires were first analyzed descriptively. For inferential statistics, chi-square statistical analysis was used and the level of significance was taken at $p < .05$. The final results were then used as the basis for qualitative evaluation of the textbook by the researcher.

Findings and Results

There were 28 items dealing with foreign language needs of the students. While the first 3 items gave an overview of the students' ideas, the other 25 represented their current and future needs more specifically. Findings of the needs analysis surveys can be seen in Tables 1, 2, and A1.

As shown in Table 1, more than half of the students (54.4%) judged speaking as the most useful skill for improving the overall English ability. The next useful skill chosen by about a quarter of students was reading. The difference between the students' ideas was reported to be significant ($p < .05$).

As Table A1 indicates, all reported means were on the positive side of the Likert-type scale. Items 2 and 3 had the

Table 2. Percentages and Chi-Square Results for Items 2 to 28.

Item	Very important		Somewhat important		Slightly important		Slightly not important		Somewhat not important		Not at all important		Total		χ^2	P	df
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
2	80	44.4	53	29.4	28	15.6	12	6.7	2	1.1	5	2.8	180	100	1.589	.000	5
3	84	46.7	59	32.8	20	11.1	13	7.2	3	1.7	1	.6	180	100	1.905	.000	5
4	28	15.6	30	16.7	66	36.7	22	12.2	11	6.1	23	12.8	180	100	59.133	.000	5
5	31	17.2	49	27.2	44	24.4	26	14.4	14	7.8	16	8.9	180	100	34.200	.000	5
6	48	26.7	30	16.7	29	16.1	28	15.55	17	9.4	28	15.55	180	100	16.733	.005	5
7	28	15.6	26	14.4	50	27.8	31	17.2	25	13.9	20	11.1	180	100	18.200	.003	5
8	42	23.3	49	24.4	44	27.2	14	7.8	13	7.2	18	10	180	100	46.333	.000	5
9	60	33.3	48	26.7	27	15	18	10	14	7.8	13	7.2	180	100	64.067	.000	5
10	43	23.9	37	20.6	38	21.1	28	15.6	17	9.45	17	9.45	180	100	20.800	.001	5
11	65	36.1	38	21.1	30	16.7	20	11.1	15	8.3	12	6.7	180	100	64.600	.000	5
12	23	12.8	48	26.7	39	21.7	23	12.8	31	17.2	16	8.9	180	100	13.333	.000	5
13	33	18.3	43	23.9	44	24.4	24	13.3	21	11.7	15	8.3	180	100	23.867	.000	5
14	67	37.2	25	13.9	29	16.1	24	13.3	21	11.7	14	7.8	180	100	58.933	.000	5
15	43	23.9	41	22.8	41	22.8	25	13.9	19	10.6	11	6.1	180	100	30.600	.000	5
16	21	11.65	37	20.6	30	16.7	38	21.1	33	18.3	21	11.65	180	100	9.467	.092	5
17	31	17.2	33	18.3	27	15	39	21.7	26	14.4	24	13.3	180	100	5.067	.408	5
18	59	32.8	40	22.2	28	15.6	21	11.7	19	10.6	13	7.2	180	100	47.867	.000	5
19	51	28.3	41	22.8	35	19.4	17	9.4	24	13.3	12	6.7	180	100	37.200	.000	5
20	27	15	46	25.6	38	21.1	27	15	27	15	15	8.3	180	100	19.067	.002	5
21	44	24.4	43	23.9	35	19.4	22	12.2	25	13.9	11	6.1	180	100	28.000	.000	5
22	59	32.8	36	20	31	17.2	20	11.1	20	11.1	14	7.8	180	100	44.467	.000	5
23	22	12.2	41	22.8	43	23.9	27	15	26	14.4	21	11.7	180	100	15.333	.009	5
24	46	25.6	45	25	38	21.1	23	12.8	14	7.8	14	7.8	180	100	36.867	.000	5
25	40	22.2	34	18.9	40	22.2	29	16.1	26	14.4	11	6.1	180	100	19.800	.001	5
26	38	21.1	49	27.2	34	18.9	26	14.4	22	12.2	11	6.1	180	100	29.400	.000	5
27	53	29.4	42	23.3	31	17.2	25	13.9	21	11.7	8	4.4	180	100	42.133	.000	5
28	51	28.3	38	21.1	29	16.1	27	15	22	12.2	13	7.2	180	100	28.933	.000	5

highest means ($M = 5.011$ and $M = 5.138$, respectively), while the lowest means belonged to Items 4 ($M = 3.850$), 6 ($M = 3.888$), 7 ($M = 3.672$), 12 ($M = 3.783$), 13 ($M = 3.988$), 16 ($M = 3.511$), 17 ($M = 3.622$), 20 ($M = 3.855$), and 23 ($M = 3.683$). It can be said that the majority of the students believed that all language skills and components were to a great extent important for them, but the level of their attention to each function was different. According to Table 2, highest percentages were related to the normal activities that students would encounter in their everyday lives (e.g., reading e-mails from foreign friends written in English, listening to English language music, speaking informally in English with foreign tourists, giving small presentations in English in university classes, writing e-mail letters in English to foreign friends, writing in English for university course papers, getting the ability to research information in English; see the appendix for more information about the content of the questionnaire). It seems that having access to technological instruments and Internet, promotion of the academic level of the universities, changes in career opportunities, and many

other factors caused the students to be inclined to use English differently and actually more authentically. This inclination was approved to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) in almost all cases.

Discussion

English Book 3, the evaluation of which was the main purpose of the current article, has some specific features. The book is organized around six lessons. The constituents of each lesson are as follows: "New Words," "Reading," "Comprehension," "Speak Out," "Write It Down," "Language Function," "Pronunciation," "Vocabulary Drill," and "Vocabulary."

Following the structural approach, the book allocates the largest proportion of each lesson to grammar. One, two, and sometimes three new structures are presented inductively through some repetition, substitution, and transformational speaking activities like the audio-lingual method (ALM). Jahangard (2007) implied that if taught properly (very

improbable in the context of Iran), this section could be beneficial to the students. However, based on the results of the present needs analysis, these mechanical activities can only satisfy a small part of the students' needs. More communicative activities are needed in this part.

The next important section that is emphasized in the book is reading. While the proportion seems to be justified for the learners' needs (Jahangard, 2007), more interesting, practical, and up-to-date topics are needed to be included in the lessons. Vocabulary can be practiced exclusively at the beginning and also at the end of each lesson (New Words and Vocabulary Drill). Yet, the number of new words that can be rehearsed is very few in comparison with the vocabulary list that is at the end of each lesson (Jahangard, 2007). In addition, the focus in such vocabulary activities is just on individual words without any reference to them in combinations (Riazi & Aryashokouh, 2007). These vocabulary exercises are not sufficient for EFL students who are not exposed to English language outside of the classrooms. Regarding the listening skill, there are no special elite activities in the book. This skill is just regarded marginally and can only be practiced indirectly in grammar and reading sections. Moreover, what comes under the title of speaking is just a set of grammar activities. Truly communicative and even semi-communicative speaking activities are completely eliminated from the textbook. The last skill, that is, writing skill, is also totally neglected in its true sense. In fact, writing activities are limited to the practice of the newly presented grammatical rules in the context of some separate sentences.

Hence, what is clear here is the exclusion of authentic communicative activities for the practice of these skills and components in the textbook. In all, the textbook analysis indicates that the Iranian high school English textbooks (including English Book 3) are not conducive to real language instruction and implementation. This lack of attention to the provision of opportunities for more authentic and communicative use of the language was also asserted by other researchers (e.g., Jahangard, 2007; Razmjoo, 2007; Riazi & Mosalanejad, 2010; Yarmohammadi, 2002).

Conclusion

English language needs analysis is significant for not only ESP courses, it is also important for general English courses (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). Textbooks, as the widely used tools for curriculum implementation and interpretation, have to be examined and analyzed within needs analysis frameworks. Having this in mind, the study was designed to evaluate high school English Book 3 in Iran with regard to the students' perceived language needs. The aim was to find out whether the textbook under study plays any role in fulfilling the present and future language needs of the students.

The participants believed that all language components and skills were highly important. They should be included in their textbooks and teaching materials. Most of the students

expressed that it was a basic requirement for them to get familiar with using English in genuine situations and in communicative ways. But their present textbook almost lacks these characteristics. Their textbook places too much emphasis on grammar and is more lenient on reading, and this does not let other skills and components flourish. Therefore, as a final remark, it can be concluded that the Iranian high school English textbook prescribed by the Ministry of Education does not meet the expectations of the learners. Reformation of the intended materials is by all means warranted as the most overarching groups from among the existing stakeholders confirm this fact.

Implications of the Study

This study can be considered as one of the few attempts that have investigated high school EFL materials in Iran from a needs analysis perspective. The textbook users' ideas give professionals and other stakeholders in the field first-hand evidence of the textbook's true efficiency. Currently, the material developers have a wider insight into what elements should be included and to what extent these elements should be emphasized in the textbook. By revising and modifying the textbook, they can improve the overall language curriculum. Furthermore, teachers would become more aware of the identified shortcomings, and can overcome them easily by supplementing the textbook with suitable additional materials.

Appendix

Needs Analysis Questions

- Which of the following skills do you feel would be most useful to learn and practice for improving your overall English ability?
(1) Reading (2) Listening (3) Speaking (4) Writing
- How important is it to have vocabulary practice in English classes?
(1) Not at all important (2) Somewhat not important (3) Slightly not important (4) Slightly important (5) Somewhat important (6) Very important
- How important is it to have grammar practice in English classes?
(1) Not at all important (2) Somewhat not important (3) Slightly not important (4) Slightly important (5) Somewhat important (6) Very important

For Questions 4 to 28, how much do you feel each of the skills is important in your life? Use the following scale for your answers.

- Not at all important (2) Somewhat not important (3) Slightly not important (4) Slightly important (5) Somewhat important (6) Very important

4. Reading English business documents/business e-mails 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Reading English articles on the Internet 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Reading English novels for pleasure 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Reading English newspapers 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Reading e-mails from foreign friends written in English 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Reading English textbooks 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Listening in meetings or small-group discussions at work with English-speaking members 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Listening to take notes of a class lecture in English 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Listening to a speech in a conference given in English 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. Watching movies or TV programs in English 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Listening to English language music 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. Speaking informally in English with foreign tourists 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. Giving formal speeches/presentations in English at international conferences 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. Giving small speeches/presentations at work 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. Giving small speeches/presentations in English in your university classes 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. Having discussions about general topics and current events in English with classmates 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. Having discussions about general topics and current events in English with foreign people 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Speaking to hotel and restaurant staff in English while traveling overseas 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. Writing in English for university course papers 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. Writing business documents in English 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. Synthesizing information from more than one source 1 2 3 4 5 6
25. Writing e-mail letters in English to foreign friends 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. Writing e-mail business letters in English to foreigners 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. Getting the ability to research information in English 1 2 3 4 5 6
28. Doing group research with classmates or co-workers in English 1 2 3 4 5 6

Table AI. Descriptive Statistics for Items 2 to 28.

Item	Range	M	SD
2	1-6	5.011	1.191
3	1-6	5.138	1.045
4	1-6	3.850	1.515
5	1-6	4.050	1.492
6	1-6	3.888	1.780
7	1-6	3.672	1.549

(continued)

Table AI. (continued)

Item	Range	M	SD
8	1-6	4.216	1.561
9	1-6	4.461	1.569
10	1-6	4.055	1.598
11	1-6	4.455	1.583
12	1-6	3.783	1.536
13	1-6	3.988	1.528
14	1-6	4.283	1.692
15	1-6	4.172	1.509
16	1-6	3.511	1.562
17	1-6	3.622	1.655
18	1-6	4.333	1.620
19	1-6	4.233	1.596
20	1-6	3.855	1.532
21	1-6	4.144	1.561
22	1-6	4.288	1.642
23	1-6	3.683	1.551
24	1-6	4.244	1.537
25	1-6	4.000	1.542
26	1-6	4.122	1.515
27	1-6	4.316	1.526
28	1-6	4.166	1.618

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

Aguilar, R. J. (1999). Sources, methods and triangulation in needs analysis: A critical perspective in a case study of Waikiki Hotel Maids. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 27-46.

Akyela, A. S., & Ozeka, Y. (2010). A language needs analysis research at an English medium university in Turkey. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Science*, 2, 969-975.

Alemi, M., & Sadehvandi, N. (2012). Textbook evaluation: EFL teachers' perspectives on "Pacesetter Series." *English Language Teaching*, 5(7), 64-74.

Aliakbari, M., & Gheitasi, M. (2014). Exploring teachers' perception of the efficacy of ELT in Iranian public schools and private language institutes. *Advances in Language & Literary Studies*, 5(2), 12-18.

Al-Madany, R. (2009, June 9). *Coursebook evaluation (HEADWAY)* [Raghdah's Blog]. Retrieved from <http://raghdah.wordpress.com/2009/06/09/coursebook-evaluation-headway/>

Balint, M. (n.d.). *Assessing students' perceived language needs in a needs analysis*. Available from <http://www.paaljapan.org/>

Berwick, R. (1989). Needs assessment in language programming: From theory to practice. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 48-62). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Bosuwon, T., & Woodrow, L. (2009). Developing a problem-based course based on needs analysis to enhance English reading ability of Thai undergraduate students. *RELC Journal*, 40, 42-64.
- Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-77). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chostelidoua, D. (2010). A needs analysis approach to ESP syllabus design in Greek tertiary education: A descriptive account of students' needs. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 4507-4512.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann, UK.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51, 36-42.
- Gholaminia Tabari, A. (2013). Challenges of language syllabus design in EFL/ESL contexts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 869-873.
- Ha, P.L. (2005). Munby's needs analysis' model and ESP. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol, 6, No. 1, October, pp.1-10.
- Harmer, J. (1996). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Hashim, H. K. E. (2003). *The relevance of academic business English textbooks to students' studying needs: A case of second year students school of management studies University of Khartoum* (A thesis submitted to the University of Khartoum). Retrieved from <http://etd.uofk.edu/admin/upload/art2007611.pdf>
- Haycroft, J. (1998). *An introduction to English language teaching*. Longman, London, UK.
- Holme, R., & Chalauisaeng, B. (2006). The learner as needs analyst: The use of participatory appraisal in the EAP reading classroom. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 403-419.
- Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal*, 48, 315-328.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning centred approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jahangard, A. (2007, September). *The evaluation of the EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools* (Karen's Linguistics Issues). Retrieved from <http://www3.telus.net/linguis-ticsissues/tefliranian.html>
- Kaewpet, C. (2008). *Meeting the needs of engineering students in an ESP EFL Thai university context* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). The University of Melbourne, Australia.
- Kaewpet, C. (2009). A framework for investigating learner needs: Needs analysis extended to curriculum development. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6, 209-220. Retrieved from <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v6n22009/kaewpet.htm>
- Kandil, A. (n.d.). *Needs analysis and the Arab learners*. Retrieved from <http://ilearn.20m.com/research/needs.htm>
- Litz, D. R. A. (2001). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: A South Korean case study. *Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved from <http://asian-efl-journal.com/thesis/2005/10/29/textbook-evaluation-and-elt-management-a-south-korean-case-study/#thetables-1-3>
- Long, M. H. (2005). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis. In M. H. Long (Ed.), *Second language needs analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press (pp.19-76).
- Mazdayasna, G., & Tahririan, M. H. (2008). Developing a profile of the ESP needs of Iranian students: The case of students of nursing and midwifery. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 277-289. Retrieved from <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jeap>
- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Oanh, D. T. H. (2007). Meeting students' needs in two EAP programs in Vietnam and New Zealand: A comparative study. *RELC Journal*, 38, 324-349.
- O'Neill, R. (1982). Why use textbooks? *ELT Journal*, 36, 104-111.
- Rahimi, M., & Hassani, M. (2012). Attitude towards EFL textbooks as a predictor of attitude towards learning English as a foreign language. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 66-72.
- Razmjoo, S. A. (2007). High schools or private institutes textbooks? Which fulfill communicative language teaching principles in the Iranian context? *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4). Retrieved from asian-efl-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/mgm/downloads/45155200.pdf
- Rezaee, A. A., Kouhpaenejad, M. H., & Mohammadi, A. (2013). Iranian EFL learners' perspectives on New Interchange series and Top-Notch series: A comparative study. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 827-840.
- Riazi, A. M. (2003). What textbook evaluation schemes tell us? A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades. In W. A. Renanda (Ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching* (pp. 52-68). Ratmanida, Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Center.
- Riazi, A. M., & Aryashokouh, A. (2007). Lexis in English textbooks in Iran: Analysis of exercises and proposals for consciousness-raising activities. *Pacific Association of Applied Linguists*, 11, 17-34.
- Riazi, A. M., & Mosalanejad, N. (2010). Evaluation of learning objectives in Iranian high school and pre-university English textbooks using Bloom's taxonomy. *TESL-EJ*, 13(4). Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volu-me13/ej52/ej52a5/>
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum design in language teaching*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2002). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK.
- Richterich, R., & Chancerel, J. L. (1977). *Identifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, UK.
- Searle, J.R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-23.
- Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42, 237-246.
- Stoller, L. F., Horn, B., Grabe, W., & Robinson, S. M. (2006). Evaluate review in materials development. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. Retrieved from <http://elsevier.com/locate/jeap>
- Tavakoli, F. (1995). *Functional analysis of the dialogues in the Iranian senior high school English textbooks* (Unpublished master's thesis). Allameh University, Tehran.
- Wan-jane, H., & Yu-Chih Doris, S. (2009). *An evaluation of junior high school English textbooks in Taiwan*. College of Foreign Languages & Literatures (Fu Jen Ta Hsueh), Fu Jen University. Available from <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/>

- Weddel, K. S., & Duzer, C. V. (1997). *Needs assessment for adult ESL learners*. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/digests/Needas.html
- Wen-Cheng, W., Chien-Hung, L., & Chung-Chieh, L. (2011). Thinking of the textbook in the ESL/EFL classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 91-96.
- Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37, 251-255.
- Yarmohammadi, L. (2002). The evaluation of pre-university textbooks. *The Newsletter of the Iranian Academy of Science*, 18, 70-87.

Author Biographies

Nasser Rashidi is an associate professor of TEFL at Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran. He has had some publications and presentations both nationally and internationally. His areas of interest include, inter alia, socio-cultural theory of learning and teaching, critical pedagogy, and discourse analysis.

Roghaye Kehtarfard got her MA in TEFL from Shiraz University in 2012. Her areas of interest are language teaching methodology and language learning.