



Teaching English as a Second Language
Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(2), Spring 2022, pp. 113-161
DOI: 10.22099/TESL.2021.40644.2999

Online ISSN: 2717-1604

Print ISSN: 2008-8191

Research Paper

Investigating Investment for Teaching English in Iranian Upper Secondary Schools: A Critical Needs Analysis Approach

Zahra Mehranfar *

Mohammad Hassan Tahririan **

Department of English Language, Sheikhbahae University, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract

This study applied a critical needs analysis approach to investigate investment (language learning commitment) needs and challenges of EFL upper secondary school learners from different socioeconomic backgrounds and school settings (privileged, middle-privileged, and less-privileged schools). To this end, Darvin and Norton's (2015) model of investment was used as our analytic framework. The study took advantage of a mixed-methods approach. A five-point Likert scale questionnaire with 53 items and one open-ended question was administered to 759 learners from different school settings in Mashhad. Also, a semi-structured interview was conducted with 24 learners for triangulation. The findings of the questionnaire and interviews revealed that speaking accurately, fluently, and professionally was the main priority for learners' investing in EFL learning. However, privileged, middle-privileged, and less-privileged upper secondary school learners perceived their needs differently regarding investment in English language learning. Although no statistically significant difference was observed between privileged, middle-privileged, and less-privileged school learners in terms of identity,

Received: 25/05/2021 Accepted: 21/11/2021

* Ph.D. Candidate, Email: shokoufe.mehranfar55@gmail.com, Corresponding Author

** Professor, Email: tahririan@shbu.ac.ir

they perceived their needs significantly different in terms of ideology and capital. The findings can bring high school learners' investment needs into focus and help the educational setting improve.

Keywords: Investment Model, Identity, Ideology, Capital, Critical Needs Analysis, Social Class

The sociological construct of investment, or language learning commitment, was developed by Norton Pierce (1995) to add to the psychological construct of motivation in the field of language learning and teaching. Motivation has been assumed to be a character trait of the individual learner (Dörnyei, 2001; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009) without comprehensively considering the unequal power relations between learners and target language speakers (Norton, 2013; Norton Pierce, 1995). Learners may resist participating in learning due to unequal circumstances, which may be due to the racist, discriminatory, sexist, and homophobic classroom practices. However, the learners who are experiencing these inequalities are mistakenly categorized as unmotivated (Norton, 2016). In other words, a mismatch between what is and what should be makes the learners unwilling to carry out their commitments to learn successfully (Brindley, 1984). This mismatch may result in the learners' needs dissatisfaction, which influences the learners' efforts in learning, and may consequently lead to failure in sustaining investment.

Investment is defined as learners' commitment to learning purposes, practices, and identities that are negotiated in different social power relations (Darvin & Norton, 2018). In the construct of investment, we can consider the learner's identity dynamically; whereas, in the construct of motivation, identity is a unitary concept (Norton, 2013; Norton Pierce, 1995). Identity

presents a sense of agency to an individual in determining self and is affected by ethnicity, history, power, and agency (Norton, 2013). Therefore, social, historical, and meaningful connections are made between learners' intentions and commitment to learning a language in the construct of investment (Norton, 2016). In other words, investment highlights the learners' commitment to learning a language considering their imagined identities and hopes for a bright future (Norton, 2016).

Concerning the dynamic nature of the investment, learners participate in more in-class activities to gain a broader range of resources such as job opportunities, social relations, and future possibilities recognized as capital (Norton, 2013). In general, capital is equal to power (Bourdieu, 1984), highlighting the importance of material resources in discussing investment and language learning.

Darvin and Norton (2015) developed a more comprehensive model of investment that integrates identity, ideology, and capital. Identity is defined as "how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is structured across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future" (Norton, 2013, p. 45).

Ideology is a "normative set of ideas" (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 43) that is shaped by symbolic and world-making power (Bourdieu, 1991). This set of ideas can be used to analyze the relationship between communicative practices and systematic patterns of control at both the micro and macro levels (Darvin & Norton, 2015). Darvin and Norton (2018) contended that institutional patterns shape regular practices, but in a specific context, learners decide to exercise agencies and position themselves as legitimate participants.

In Darvin and Norton's (2015) model of investment, identity and ideology move in concert with capital as the third element. Capital refers to

sums of benefits put to productive use (Bourdieu, 1986). These perceived benefits take various forms as economic (wealth, property, and income), cultural (knowledge, educational credential, and specific cultural forms), and social capital (connections to the networks of power) that are influential in elevating the chances of the learners' success and investment (Norton, 2013; Bourdieu, 1977, 1984, 1991).

Investment through the interplay of identity, ideology, and capital highlights the paramount effects of the learners' participation in language classrooms despite the existing power relations (Norton, 2013). The learners' economic, social, and cultural contexts of living increase inequalities in power relationships and affect their investment (Darvin & Norton, 2015). Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) argued that the schools' systematic patterns of control reinforce social inequalities through norms and values that are more familiar to middle-class learners. This way, less-privileged learners may resist participating in-class activities by virtue of social class (Darvin & Norton, 2018). Since so many political, cultural, social, and economic factors are involved in learning, it is significant "to discover what needs to be learned and what the learners want to learn" (Nation & Macalister, 2010, p. 24). A precise needs analysis that brings the components of Darvin and Norton's (2015) investment model into account addresses some of these concerns. Such a needs analysis should focus on power relations, learners' agencies, and democratic participation (Benesch, 2001).

It seems inevitable that in non-English-dominant countries such as Iran, opportunities to use English are limited to the classroom. However, with the growing acceptance of English as the lingua franca, English language proficiency is viewed as a vital linguistic capital for investment. Different studies have investigated the phenomenon of identity and investment in

education in the EFL milieu and showed how foreign language learners invest differently in learning (Haneda, 2005; Karimifard, 2012; Khatib & Samadibahrami, 2013; SamadiBahrami, 2013; Teng, 2018; Vasilopoulos, 2015; Wu, 2017). Soltanian et al., (2018) contended that "The reasons why Iranian EFL learners demonstrated a moderate level of investment in learning the English language can be various and more in-depth mixed-methods studies are needed to focus specifically on the why of this issue" (Soltanian et al., 2018, p. 149). There is a scarcity of comprehensive research conducted to operationalize the investment needs of the learners from different social classes regarding Darwin and Norton's (2015) investment model in the EFL milieu.

Hence, to address the gap in the literature, the present study aimed to tap the Iranian upper secondary school learners' investment needs through the interplay of Darwin and Norton's (2015) investment model elements. To this end, a critical needs analysis approach involving the three major aspects of the necessities, lacks, and wants were applied to the learners from different social classes in privileged, middle-privileged, and less-privileged school settings to examine their investment needs in English language learning.

Literature Review

Theoretical Background

The sociological construct of investment within its three elements of identity, ideology, and capital has received substantial attention in language learning and teaching. Paying attention to the superficiality of the dichotomy between the individual learner and the social world, Norton Peirce (1995) has invested in the reconceptualization of the issue. She argued that the literature is ambiguous on the relationship between affective factors and social contexts.

Some scholars (e.g., Krashen, 1981) viewed affective variables as independent of social context, whereas others (e.g., Spolsky, 1989) regarded them as an interwoven construct. Such disagreement has raised the question of why a learner is motivated, extroverted, and socially interacted in one context while unmotivated, introverted, and silent in another environment. Besides, how power relations are implicated in social interactions between language learners and target language speakers has remained intact. Accordingly, Norton Peirce (1995) has proposed a theory of social identity, which elaborates on the existing power relations in social interaction between learners and target language speakers.

Norton Peirce (1995) drew on Weedon's (1987) notion of subjectivity. Subjectivity is referred to as "the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world" (Weedon, 1987, p. 32). From this perspective, subjectivity is multiple, contradictory, and a site of struggle that underscores social identity's dynamic nature across time and space (Weedon, 1987). Moreover, Norton Peirce (1995) elaborated on the notion of agency in language learning, which gives more powerful identities to learners. This way, learners become more active participants in the class.

Also, Norton Peirce (1995) has identified requirements to challenge the concept of motivation besides identity. She stated that the relationship between identity, power relations, and language learning is not clarified in motivation; therefore, she proposed the notion of investment to be an economic metaphor that is rooted in the notion of cultural capital by Bourdieu (1977). In this regard, she contended that learners invest in learning with the choice of having a profitable return in terms of their achievement, which can

create more powerful identities based on different material and symbolic resources.

Focusing on the impact of the dynamic nature of learners' identities, the multiplicity of their linguistic repertoires, and the negotiation of power, Darwin and Norton (2015) provided a critical framework at the intersection of identity, ideology, and capital. They argued that these elements profoundly affect the learner's identity and language learning and are one of the greatest challenges of language education (Darwin, 2016; Darwin & Norton, 2014, 2016, 2018).



Figure 1
Darwin and Norton's (2015) Model of Investment

Note. From "Identity and a Model of Investment in Applied Linguistics," by R. Darwin and B. Norton, 2015, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, p.42.

Thus, investment elements have overlapping characteristics that demonstrate identity in terms of positioning, ideology in terms of systematic control patterns, and capital as affordances.

Research Developments in Investment in Language Learning

Earlier research on Norton's construct of investment and identity was conducted in North America and considered the learners and the learning contexts. The investment was considered a noteworthy construct with important implications for language policymakers. Researchers found that identity and power relations are interrelated and affect learners' investment in schools and societies (e.g., Barse & de Jong, 2008; Cummins, 2006; Haneda, 2005; McKay & Wong, 1996; Pittaway, 2004; Potowski, 2004; Skilton-Sylvester, 2002). In this regard, Pittaway (2004) contended that reducing the distance between teachers and learners through interaction results in distributing equal power between them and maintains investment. Similarly, Haneda (2005) argued that learners' different levels of investment in learning L2 reflect their differences in their life histories, their commitment to their purposes, and their weaknesses and strengths in L2.

Later studies on identity and investment became more widely international. The studies mostly focused on the construction, dynamicity, and multiplicity of the learners' identities. Also, the researchers argued that the learners' imagination, desires, and agency for belonging to their imagined communities enhance their investment. Accessing valuable resources (capital) was regarded as important in fostering investment. However, the notion of capital was not directly determined as an essential element in the construct of investment as identity was. In this regard, Norton and Williams (2012) researched portable digital libraries to study digital literacy. They elaborated on the dynamicity and multiplicity of their learners' identities. Learners moved from being trainees and learners to trainers and teachers. They shared their knowledge with other learners and teachers to have equal access to social networking and became valuable members of their school and

community. Concerning teachers and learners` exercising agency, Ollerhead (2012) sought to investigate how creative teachers exercise their agencies in challenging situations. Teachers remediate language practices in a meaningful context to give learners a sense of ownership of the target language. In the same vein, Early and Norton (2014), Crowther (2019), and Sung (2019) discussed how the perception of communal acceptance, which refers to peers` host receptivity in school, or communal rejection, influences investment.

Darvin and Norton (2015) extended theories of identity and investment. They developed an investment model at the intersection of identity, ideology, and capital, considering a more dynamic and mobile world. Different researchers utilized the investment model as their studies` framework to scrutinize how language learners participate in unlimited spaces of learning and socialization to exercise their agency and become legitimate and invested learners.

Moving through the interplay of the investment model components (identity, ideology, and capital), Darvin and Norton (2015) re-analyzed two case studies of two learners who were located in different parts of the world; Henrietta in Uganda and Ayrton in Canada. Both of them participated in studies on the use of digital literacies on different subjects. Dominant ideologies and different access to capital made them invest differently in the language practices of their communities. It seems that Henrietta`s social location and economic condition as less-privileged served as big challenges for Henrietta to fulfill her strong desire. On the other hand, Ayrton`s social position as privileged allowed him to exercise a great sense of agency towards reaching an identity of a "knowledgeable person". Similarly, in a collaborative study in Canada, Iran, Pakistan, and Uganda, Norton referred to the investment model to reflect on the data of the research (Norton, 2015). To

address learners' imagined identities and their impact on investment, she stated that learners in these countries invest in English as a lingua Franca that relates them to the world and makes them multilingual. Finally, she suggested that digital storytelling might increase classroom investment and help learners use their knowledge and experience, access cultural capital, be legitimate speakers, and be heard.

Considering research developments in identity, investment, and L2 learning in Iran, researchers examined the multiplicity of the learners' identities while learning English. Their findings contain key implications for learners' active participation or resistance to English language learning. For instance, Karimifard (2012) represented multiple Iranian identities as national, religious, and western. In this regard, Saboori et al. (2015) addressed the relationship between multiple Iranian identities and cultural dimensions. To them, indulgence predicted national identity, whereas western identity predictors were power distance and individualism. Additionally, power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and short-term orientation were considered predictors of religious identity. In the same vein, Khatib and SamadiBahrami (2013) examined Iranian EFL learners' multicultural developmental trends from BA to post-graduate levels in the light of investment. They noticed that the duration of exposure to the English language from BA to Ph.D. played an important role in developing multicultural personality traits development (MPTs). SamadiBahrami (2013), found a strong correlation between high language proficiency and MPTs, especially with flexibility, emotional stability, and open-mindedness. The learners' imagined identities as perfect bilinguals enhanced their commitments to learning.

Through the interplay of identity, ideology, and capital of Darwin and Norton's (2015) investment model, Soltanian et al. (2018) developed and validated a questionnaire to quantify investment in the Iranian language context. Similarly, in another study, Soltanian et al. (2018) measured learners' investment in English language learning via a questionnaire and found a moderate level of investment by the majority of the males and females with different proficiency levels. However, the researchers did not discuss the reasons.

Different studies have investigated investment from various aspects in ESL and EFL contexts in the reviewed literature. However, limited attention has been given to exploring the investment needs of learners from different social classes. Hence, to fill this gap, the present study utilized Darwin and Norton's (2015) investment model and a critical needs analysis to investigate the necessities, lacks, and wants of the learners from different social classes in privileged, middle-privileged, and less-privileged school settings.

In doing so, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the Iranian upper secondary school learners' perceived needs for enhancing investment in English language learning in privileged, middle-privileged, and less-privileged learners?
2. What significant differences exist in the investment for language learning between privileged, middle-privileged, and less-privileged Iranian upper secondary school learners?

Method

Design

To follow an appropriate methodological approach in needs analysis and to enhance the credibility of the findings, the data were collected through a

mixed-methods approach for the first question and a quantitative method for the second. Initially, we utilized a mixed-methods approach to investigate the perceived needs of the upper secondary school learners. Next, we investigated if there was any statistically significant difference between the upper secondary school learners' perceived investment needs in different social classes and school settings. We sought the needs of the learners in three social classes and schools' settings via a questionnaire and then scrutinized the matter in-depth through interviews. This way, we chose (QUAN→ qual) explanatory sequential mixed-methods design which represents a quantitatively oriented mixed-methods research (Dornyei, 2007).

Participants

This research took advantage of convenience sampling for selecting the participants because of the COVID-19 pandemic and relative ease of accessibility. Initially, we tried to find learners' socioeconomic backgrounds because the present research aimed to investigate whether inequalities in social groups created a knowledge gap (Lindell, 2020). We needed objective criteria for assigning students to different socioeconomic settings because objectivism is preferable to subjectivism in class determination in scientific approaches to sociology. Nevertheless, the provocative issue was that it was hard to select samples representing low, middle, and high socioeconomic classes in schools. In other words, it was not reasonable to assign students to these groups merely based on their revealed information. We were fortunate to realize that the researchers of the Mashhad Education Department (MED) had already categorized schools into privileged (P), middle-privileged (MP), and less-privileged (LP). This standardized classification paved the way for the systematic scrutiny of the present study through the backup of MED

researchers and the information that the participants revealed about their social and economic status.

A sample of 759 male and female (male=399 and female=360) upper secondary school students (10th, 11th, and 12th graders), aged between 14 and 19 studying in Mashhad, were recruited to take part in the present study. To provide an appropriate sample size for the three groups, the researchers applied Cochran's formula. Accordingly, the threshold was considered 580 in total, 195 for P, 195 for MP, and 190 for LP. The number of participants was beyond Cochran's formula threshold, P (n=235), MP (n=334), and LP (n=190). They were selected based on MED classifications.

This study was done under the observation of MED, and the data was gathered, checked, and monitored by them.

Instruments

The learners were asked to give their views via a questionnaire and interviews.

Questionnaire

The validated questionnaires which we adopted in this study were developed by Soltanian et al. (2018) and Soltanian et al. (2020). They had been specifically developed for the Iranian context. After discussing with experts, the questionnaire items were modified to serve our purposes for analyzing the upper secondary school students' perceived investment needs. The modified questionnaire included 53 items for exploring the learners' opinions about their perceived investment needs in English language classrooms. It contained 7 components on different aspects of investment, i.e., identity, ideology, and capital. All the 53 items were prepared based on a five-

point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). There was also one open-ended wh-question.

The content validity of the modified questionnaire was checked with three experienced faculty members of Sheikhabaee University of Isfahan and Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. Concerning the construct validity, the exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of the questionnaire was established by Soltanian et al. (2018). To ensure the construct validity of the modified questionnaire, the researchers ensured the congruency of the questionnaire items with the theories of investment in language learning in the literature. To evaluate the construct validity of the modified questionnaire, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used. Principal component analysis was used as the method of component extraction with varimax rotation. Concerning the appropriateness of the sample size for conducting EFA in the questionnaire, the measure of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was selected. The overall value of KMO turned out to be .877 (KMO= .877), which could be considered reasonable for sampling adequacy and appropriateness of factor analysis (Field, 2009). On the other hand, Bartlett's test of sphericity $\chi^2(1378) = 6642.671$, $P \leq .001$ indicated statistically significant results for the patterned correlations between the items (see Table 1).

Table 1

Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.877
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6642.671
	df	1378
	Sig.	.000

Preceding the main analysis, an eigenvalue of 1 as Kaiser’s criterion was selected for the extraction of the components. The result indicated that 13 components were above the point of inflection.

The minimum factor loading value of this analysis was selected to be 0.4 based on Field’s (2009) suggestion. The result of the analysis revealed eigenvalues of 5.971, 3.827, 3.685, 3.075, 2.970, 2.755, 2.564, 2.101, 1.791, 1.749, 1.597, 1.507, and 1.482 respectively for the component 1 to 13 after rotation. Table 2 shows initial and rotated eigenvalues, variance, and cumulative percentage before and after rotation.

Table 2
Eigenvalues Before and After Rotation

Comp onent	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	Variance	% of Cumulativ e %	Total	Variance	% of Cumulativ e %	Total	Variance	% of Cumulativ e %
1	13.593	25.647	25.647	13.593	25.647	25.647	5.971	11.266	11.266
2	4.062	7.664	33.311	4.062	7.664	33.311	3.827	7.221	18.487
3	2.764	5.215	38.526	2.764	5.215	38.526	3.685	6.953	25.440
4	2.083	3.930	42.457	2.083	3.930	42.457	3.075	5.801	31.242
5	1.899	3.584	46.040	1.899	3.584	46.040	2.970	5.604	36.846
6	1.623	3.063	49.103	1.623	3.063	49.103	2.755	5.197	42.043
7	1.547	2.919	52.022	1.547	2.919	52.022	2.564	4.838	46.881
8	1.486	2.804	54.826	1.486	2.804	54.826	2.101	3.964	50.845
9	1.386	2.616	57.442	1.386	2.616	57.442	1.791	3.380	54.226
10	1.259	2.375	59.816	1.259	2.375	59.816	1.749	3.300	57.525
11	1.184	2.235	62.051	1.184	2.235	62.051	1.597	3.012	60.538
12	1.111	2.095	64.146	1.111	2.095	64.146	1.507	2.844	63.382
13	1.077	2.032	66.179	1.077	2.032	66.179	1.482	2.797	66.179

Note. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The findings indicate that all 13 components could be extracted. This number was retained for factor loadings after rotation. The varimax rotation was used. The components were labeled based on Darwin and Norton's (2015) investment model criteria. The items clustered in the same categories suggested identity, ideology, and capital.

Our framework for collecting data started with a pilot study on a sample of 50 English language learners with similar characteristics to the main participants. To ensure the understanding of the items, the questionnaire was translated into Persian. Two experts in the field also confirmed the validity and relevance of the translation. The SPSS version 23 was used to check the reliability, which was 0.879, which is an acceptable estimation for the instrument.

Interviews

A semi-structured interview was conducted to elicit data from the participants. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the interviews were conducted via video call and telephone. Six questions were prepared for 24 learners, 8 from each group of the participants, to investigate their needs, preferences, and difficulties in investing in language learning from the perspective of Darwin and Norton's (2015) investment model. To ensure the validity of the interviews, the questions were checked by three experts in the field. The researchers spent about 20 minutes on each interview. To remove any ambiguities and misunderstandings, the interviews were conducted in Persian and then transcribed and translated into English. The confidentiality of the responses and the anonymity of the respondents were guaranteed.

Data Collection Procedure

Concerning the main phases of the study, the researchers were required to have the permission of MED to administer the electronic questionnaire to the learners. After scrutinizing the items of the questionnaires for appropriateness, the decision-makers of MED gave permission, and the electronic version of the questionnaire was installed on the MED website. The school principals were responsible for putting the questionnaire file on SHAAD software, the educational network of students in Iran, to be accessible to the students. Finally, the excel files of 864 responses were delivered to the present researchers by MED in four months. After data screening/cleaning, only 759 responses had quality for actual analysis.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed to describe the collected data by the questionnaire. Some of the items were reverse-coded before running the computation by SPSS because they were negatively keyed items. We relied on the frequencies and percentages for the first research question to scrutinize the learners' perceived investment needs. For the second research question, based on the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Table 3), we realized that some parts of the data were normally distributed while other parts did not. We used Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney U non-parametric tests to investigate the statistically significant differences between the groups to stay on the safe side.

Latent content analysis was employed to analyze the transcripts of the interviews and the answers to the open-ended wh-question at the end of the questionnaire. To do so, Dornyei's (2007) methodology of latent content analysis, including the following four phases, were utilized: "(a) transcribing

the data, (b) pre-coding and coding, (c) growing ideas, and (d) interpreting the data and drawing conclusions” (p. 246). After transcribing and translating the data, the researchers read and re-read them individually, reflected on the transcripts, and noted down their opinions. Then they categorized the students’ responses to several codes. The codes were reduced and organized into 9 themes which were presented with interpretation and explanation.

Results

Learners’ Perceived Needs in Investment: Identity, Ideology, and Capital

The viewpoints of overall 759 LP, MP, and P students concerning their investment needs in learning the English language at the intersection of identity, ideology, and capital were elicited by the questionnaire with 53 items (Appendix A). We excluded the report of frequencies and percentages for every single response to save space.

Based on the results, the majority of LP, MP, and P students showed similar viewpoints in response to 46 items. That is, the majority of each group of the participants regarded their perceived needs by showing their different levels of agreement (agree or strongly agree) with 34 items and disagreement (disagree or strongly disagree) with 5 items. Moreover, this majority was neutral towards 7 items. Among the 46 items with similar viewpoints, the first 10 highest percentage responses for each group were extracted. The commonalities of the three groups are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 1 represents the groups’ highest percentage responses regarding agreement answers related to identity, ideology, and capital sections.

Table 3
Percentile of the Items which Received the Highest Positive Responses from the Three Groups

Items	LP		MP		P	
	Agree %	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Strongly agree %
2.I need English to speak fluently and accurately.	40.2	48.1	37.8	50.5	32.5	59.8
7.I need English to be a professional language speaker.	25.5	56.9	26.7	57.1	28.4	60.8
12.I need English exercises that match my goals.	36.7	45.2	42.8	45.8	40.0	49.8
25.I need to use English actively in class.	40.6	46.5	35.9	47.3	36.3	46.6
48.I see English as a gateway to academic opportunities.	41.6	40.0	48.0	37.5	37.9	50.6

© Shiraz University

Table 3 shows the 5 items that had the highest degrees of commonalities in an agreement between the three groups. The items centered on the needs for speaking fluently and accurately (LP=88.3%, MP=88.3%, P=92.3%), being a professional language speaker (LP=82.4%, MP=83.8%, P=89.2%), matching English exercises with learners' goals (LP=81.9%, MP=88.6%, P=89.8%), using English actively in class (LP=87.1%, MP=83.2%, P=82.9%), and evaluating English as a gateway to academic opportunities (LP=81.6%, MP=85.5%, P=88.5%).

The majority of LP, MP, and P learners expressed different levels of disagreement concerning items (23, 33, 35, 44, & 45). The items related to the need for English just to pass the exam, not speaking in language class because

of the teacher's frequent negative feedbacks on students' speaking skills, feeling nervous to use technology to learn English, thinking learning the English language and speaking it is ridiculous, and considering learning English as a betrayal of Iranian culture and identity failed to be agreed upon by the majority of the students in the three groups. Items 44(LP=65.8%, MP=81.7%, P=81.6%) and 45(LP=63%, MP=81.8%, P=84.3%) were regarded as the common highest disagreed items between the groups. Table 4 illustrates the results in detail.

Table 4
Percentile of the Items which Received the Highest Negative Responses from the Three Groups

Items	LP		MP		P	
	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree%	Disagree %	Strongly disagree%	Disagree %	Strongly disagree%
23. I need English just to pass the exams.	31.7	27.5	38	41.3	29.5	51.7
33. My teachers' frequent negative feedback on my speaking have made me prefer not to speak in language classes.	25.7	20.3	32.7	20.1	31.5	31.9
35. I feel nervous to use	25.5	18.1	27.7	23.2	26.9	39.3

Items	LP		MP		P	
	Disagree %	Strongly Disagree%	Disagree %	Strongly disagree%	Disagree %	Strongly disagree%
technology to learn English.						
44. I think learning the English language and speaking it is ridiculous.	24.7	41.1	29	52.7	21.5	60.1
45. I see learning English as a betrayal of Iranian culture and identity.	21.2	41.8	23.4	58.4	13.2	71.1

Additionally, the majority of LP, MP, and P students kept harmony in their neutral response "no idea" to 7 items (8, 9, 14, 15, 26, 28, &37). The items related to the need for English to have westernized habits (LP=51.6%, MP=46%, P=39.8%), to have a hybrid identity (LP=41.9%, MP=46%, P=40.2%), to change as a person (LP=46.2%, MP=42.6%, P=47%), and to think differently (LP=41.9%, MP=43.6%, P=42.9%) received neutral perspectives from the three groups. Items 26 (LP=38.5%, MP=46.2%, P=43.2%), 28 (LP=43.3%, MP=42.7%, P=45.3%), and 37 (LP=43%, MP=41.3%, P=43%) which contained some measures of how power relations affect learning remained neutral as well.

However, the majority of LP, MP, and P students expressed different points of view regarding the points in the rest of the items (19, 21, 22, 27, 29,

30, & 46). The majority of the variance in responses belonged to the ideology section which underscored how the participants in each group were affected by the systematic patterns of control and power relations. LP (46.6%) and MP (50.6%) students were neutral towards item 19 "I need English because it gives me the voice to be heard." while P (62.1%) students showed different levels of agreement. LP (48.4%) students agreed upon the point in item 21 "I need to be in English course because it is a requirement." whereas MP (57.3%) and P (61.5%) students disagreed. In the point in item 22 "I need English just to do the exercises in the textbook." LP (43.3%) students showed agreement while MP (72.7%) and P (76.1%) students strongly disagreed. LP (64.6%), and MP (53.7%) students' paid special attention to item 27 "I need others to listen to me when I speak English in class. "by showing agreement," while P (45.2%) students shared "no idea" response. As item 29 regards "I dislike my school English book." LP (37.5%) and MP (44.9%) students' responses were neutral, while P (55.8%) students showed different levels of agreement. LP (43.1%) students considered item 30 "In English class, I experience a greater degree of freedom in learning." as neutral, while MP (45.3%) and P (53%) students were in agreement. MP (46.1%) and P (52.3%) students agreed upon the point in item 46 "My limited language proficiency reduces my ambitions." while LP (43.8%) students disagreed.

The Qualitative Phase for the First research question

To provide a deeper insight into the topic, the results of the open-ended question, which 759 participants answered, and the results of interviews with 24 participants were content analyzed and summarized in the form of 9 themes. Due to space limitations, only some interview extracts were summarized and transcribed. Concerning students' preferences, the three

groups viewed English language learning as a means of achieving future success. For instance, LP students mentioned that *“English can help me to find a good job with a good salary”*. This assumption was common among three groups, which underlines the influence of the English language on the materialistic goals of students.

Concerning the students' difficulties in learning English at school, most of the participants in the three groups felt dissatisfied with online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, a P student stated that *“the software that has been chosen for online teaching has too many internet connectivity problems; it seems that the educational system has not been prepared for the COVID-19 pandemic. Besides, the educational system has not made any attempts to improve the situation”*. Unlike our expectations in terms of the availability of the resources for the privileged group, the three groups were equally unsatisfied with virtual classes.

Lack of enough exposure to English because of the duration of English language classrooms was another underlined difficulty. This theme pinpoints the weakness of proper needs analysis research for developing a curriculum in the Iranian context. An MP student mentioned that *“it is better to have more English classes in a week, but it seems impossible because of our educational system. We have to spend more time and money on extra English classes out of school time”*.

Our in-depth investigations also drew on four other themes: teachers' passivity, lack of management, boring class atmosphere, and teaching to test. In addition to problematizing the educational system, the learners also complained about their teachers. One of them in the MP group mentioned that *“Our teacher is boring. He only teaches the book”*. This comment can underline several important factors. Firstly, the educational system forces

teachers to stick to the prescribed and predetermined materials. In this case, teachers teach to prepare learners for tests. Similarly, another student mentioned, “*our teacher is a good teacher; she teaches very well but she only prepares us for the final exam; we want her to work on our speaking too*”.

Another problem that restricts teachers’ productivity and flexibility is the role of materials. In this regard, the inappropriately prescribed books and insufficient linguistic resources were considered the other two important themes. One P student stated that “*our book is neither good nor interesting; teachers can search the net and provide us with more interesting and applicable texts with listening tasks, films, and songs*”. This student may have had the experience of learning the language in private institutes that use commercial textbooks. This is also another problematic area in the material development of Iran; the materials are different from the imported textbooks. Some of these findings are directly in line with the learners’ perceived needs in their questionnaires. For instance, they talked about their intentions for learning English that go beyond passing an exam. They disagreed with the item (I need English just to pass the exams) in the questionnaire. In the following section, the results for the second question are examined.

Differences between LP, MP, and P Students’ Investment Needs: Identity, Ideology, and Capital

For the second research question, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run to check the normality assumptions of the data. The results revealed that the data were normally distributed in the identity section in LP, $D(190) = 0.04$, $p > .05$, and the total in the identity section, $D(190) = 0.05$, $p > .05$, along with the ideology section in P, $D(235) = 0.04$, $p > .05$, respectively. On the contrary, the data were not normally distributed ($p < .05$) in other sections as presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Result of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality

	LP			MP			P		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Identity	.048	190	.200*	.071	334	.000	.072	235	.005
Ideology	.085	190	.002	.054	334	.020	.040	235	.200*
Capital	.067	190	.037	.087	334	.000	.097	235	.000
Total	.059	190	.200*	.088	334	.000	.079	235	.001

© Shiraz University

To compare the perceptions of the three groups (P, MP, & LP) regarding English language perceived investment needs (question 2), the Kruskal-Wallis test was applied, the results of which are presented in Table 6. According to Table 6, there were statistically significant differences between the groups LP (n= 190, mean rank= 353.45), MP (n=334, mean rank= 361.56), and P (n=235, mean rank=427.68) in their perceptions of investment needs, $H(2) = 16.264$, $p < .05$. This result rejected the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the three groups in terms of their perception of investment needs.

Table 6
Results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test for Differences between LP, MP, and P Students Regarding English Language Perceived Investment Needs

	N	Mean Rank
LP	190	353.45
MP	334	361.56
P	235	427.68
Total	759	
Chi-Square		16.264
Df		2
Asymp. Sig.		.000

For further scrutiny, three follow-up post hoc Mann-Whitney U tests were run to determine whether the difference between LP and MP, LP and P, and the one between MP and P were statistically significant. This section was analyzed based on the overall scores in the three groups regardless of other variables (identity, ideology, and capital). The overall test results in Table 7 show that the difference between the mean rank of LP (n=190, mean rank=258.74) and that of MP (n=334, mean rank=264.64) was not statistically significant, $U=31016$, $z= -.429$, $p>.05$. LP and MP have a similar perception of investment in language learning.

Table 7
Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences between the Three Groups of Participants

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
LP	190	258.74	49161.00	190.21	36140.00	-	-
MP	334	264.64	88389.00	-	-	264.42	88316.00
P	235	-	-	231.43	54385.00	314.25	73849.00
Total	759						
Mann-Whitney U		31016.000		17995.000		32371.000	
Z		-.429		-3.440		-3.560	
Asymp. Sig.		.668		.001		.000	

However, the mean rank of LP (n=190, mean rank=190.21) and that of P (n=235, mean rank=231.43) were statistically significant, $U=17995$, $z= -3.440$, $p<.05$. This result indicates that there was a statistically significant difference between LP and P in their perceived investment needs. Furthermore, the result approved the significant difference between MP

(n=334, mean rank=264.42) and that of P (n=235, mean rank=314.25), U=32371, z= -3.560, p<.05.

The statistical analysis revealed the overall differences between the three groups. To investigate the details of the differences, another Kruskal-Wallis test was run to scrutinize the investment elements (identity, ideology, and capital) between the groups, the results of which appear in Table 8. According to the Table 8, there was no statistically significant difference between LP (mean rank=385.88), MP (mean rank=359.76), and P (mean rank= 404.01) in terms of identity, H (2) = 5.806, p>.05.

Table 8
Results of Kruskal-Wallis Test among the Three Groups about Identity, Ideology, and Capital

		Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Identity	LP	385.88	5.806	2	.055
	MP	359.76			
	P	404.01			
Ideology	LP	335.68	22.237	2	.000
	MP	368.25			
	P	432.54			
Capital	LP	340.90	18.359	2	.000
	MP	368.35			
	P	428.16			

In contrast to the component of identity, the results of the test for the ideology H (2) = 22.237, p<.05, and the capital H (2) = 18.359, p<.05, revealed statistically significant differences between the three groups of students respectively.

To investigate differences among the three groups in the ideology section, three follow-up post hoc Mann-Whitney U tests were run. Table 9 shows the

differences among the mean ranks of the three groups, comparing each pair separately. The differences between the mean rank of LP (n= 190, mean rank= 248.87) and that of MP (n=334, mean rank= 270.25) were not statistically significant, U= 29140, z= -1.555, p> .05.

Table 9

Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences between Every Two Groups of Participants Regarding the Students' Perceptions of Needs in Ideology

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
LP	190	248.87	47285.00	182.31	34638.50	-	-
MP	334	270.25	90265.00	-	-	265.50	88675.50
P	235	-	-	237.81	55886.50	312.72	73489.50
Total	759						
Mann-Whitney U		29140.000		16493.500		32730.500	
Z		-1.555		-4.634		-3.375	
Asymp. Sig.		.120		.000		.001	

The mean ranks between LP (n=190, mean rank=182.31) and that of P (n=235, mean rank=237.81) were statistically significant, U= 16493.5, z= -4.634, p<.05. Also, the result indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between MP and P, U= 32730.5, z= -3.375, p<.05.

Three other post hoc Mann-Whitney U tests were run to compare the three groups in pairs in the element of capital. The results, as presented in Table 10, indicated that the differences between LP (n=190, mean rank=250.08), and MP (n=334, mean rank= 269.57) were not statistically significant, U= 29370, z= -1.418, p> .05.

Table 10

Results of the Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences between Every Two Groups of Participants Regarding Students' Perceptions of Needs in Capital

	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
LP	190	250.08	47515.00	186.32	35401.50		
MP	334	269.57	90035.00			266.29	88940.50
P	235			234.57	55123.50	311.59	73224.50
Total	759						
Mann-Whitney U		29370.000		17256.500		32995.500	
Z		-1.418		-4.030		-3.240	
Asymp. Sig.		.156		.000		.001	

However, the Mann-Whitney U test result indicated a statistically significant difference between LP and P, $U=17256.5$, $z=-4.030$, $p<.05$. There was also a statistically significant difference between MP and P, $U= 32995.5$, $z= -3.240$, $p<.05$.

Discussion

The present study used a mixed-methods approach to explore the perceived needs of upper secondary school students (LP, MP, and P) for enhancing their investment in English language learning.

Research Question 1

The first research question explored LP, MP, and P students' perceived investment needs related to their necessities, lacks, and wants in terms of identity, ideology, and capital via a questionnaire and interview. In terms of identity, all the three groups supported the ideas related to the students' imagination and desires for belonging and recognition (e.g., I need English to

be an international student living in an English speaking country), identity construction, and promotion (e.g., I need my teacher to connect English exercises to my daily life), and students' agency (e.g., I take the responsibility for my English language learning) as their perceived needs for the English language learning investment. More particularly, LP, MP, and P students believed that speaking fluently and accurately, being a professional English speaker, and matching English exercises with their goals was the status they so desired. This way, the academic achievements were high spots of the participants' perceived needs concerning identity. Moreover, speaking skills as one of the students' desires to achieve, were of great value to them compared to other skills. This finding aligns with Norton (2015) and SamadiBahrami (2013), as participants' strong desires and imagined identities as perfect bilinguals may stimulate a passion for learning and forming identities. This study also supported Haneda's (2005) and Ollerhead's (2012) findings which emphasized commitment to learning and shift in identities that affect students' relations in L2 classrooms and shape more participation and greater sense of agencies. That might be the reason why our three groups of participants were ardent supporters of matching English exercises with their goals and daily lives. This way, they wanted to experience a sense of ownership of the English language and exercise agencies to reach their desires.

However, our participants were neutral towards the perceived needs related to the manifestation of multiple, dynamic and evolving nature of identity (having westernized habits, having a hybrid identity, changing as a person, and thinking differently). To explain this neutral position, Saboori et al. (2015) contended that the authoritative discourse of the state has been applying an anti-western approach and western culture dominance. Therefore,

Iranian students' national, religious, and western identities conflict with each other (Karimifard, 2012).

This confrontation of identities makes Iranians intolerant of ambiguous circumstances (Saboori et al., 2015). That might be the reason why LP, MP, and P students were uncertain about accepting the multiplicity and dynamicity of their identities. Furthermore, it seems that negotiation between national, religious, and western identities is a site of continuous struggle for LP, MP, and P students. This kind of struggle may stem from the society, families, or schools' input, which creates a sense of belonging for students. According to Fernsten (2008), students are required to challenge the opinions of authorities rather than trusting them as truth. Teachers play important roles for students in order not to be passive language learners. Teachers are expected to transmit the English language norms to students; however, they are not highly competent in this regard (SoodmandAfshar & Yousefi, 2019). The interview findings also highlight that teachers constrain students' identity as learners of the language for academic purposes.

Concerning LP, MP, and P students' ideologically perceived needs, our participants showed their enthusiasm to use English actively in class (e.g., I need English to feel powerful, I need English to search on English websites to be able to talk about English subjects in class, proficient students in class improve my learning, etc.). LP, MP, and P students attempted to be "legitimate" participants in the class. This finding is in line with Pittaway (2004) in that students manipulated the issue of ideology by constructing more powerful identities through exercising agencies that re-positioned them from peripheral students to legitimate participants (Pittaway, 2004).

LP, MP, and P students disagreed with the ideas like (I need English just to pass the exams, my teacher's frequent negative feedback on my speaking

have made me prefer not to speak in language classes, and I feel nervous to use technology to learn English). This high disagreement rejects three important reasons for the marginalization in classrooms between the groups. This finding takes Norton's (2015) ideological position into account. Students invest more in learning English due to ideological manipulation of linguistic imperialism, which is dictated to be the key to success (Norton, 2015). Therefore, to our participants, success was not determined by the merit of passing the exams. Also, they exercised agencies despite teachers' frequent negative feedback. This way, they try to be active participants. Concerning using technology, our participants desired to develop their digital knowledge and skills in learning English and position themselves as valuable school and community members. This finding verifies Norton and Williams' (2012) findings. Ideology reflects students positioning. Accordingly, systematic patterns of control value using technology as an essential in language learning to encourage students to aspire to succeed in learning the language (Darvin & Norton, 2015). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the students put too much value on using technology; however, they were not very satisfied with the way it was applied during the pandemic. They mentioned that the educational system seemed not to be programmed for the situation. Moreover, the internet connection's slow speed, which was under the supervision of the state, was an underscored issue.

There were great variances in responses by the three groups regarding some other reasons for marginalization and legitimization. The variances may be due to the different power relations between students' social classes as LP, MP, and P. These relationships affect their positioning as language learners in their perception of needs ideologically. Regarding the need for English to give the voice to be heard, LP and MP students were neutral, while P students

agreed. It seems that "people who suffer the most from a given state of affairs are paradoxically the least likely to question, challenge, reject, or change it" (Jost et al., 2003, p. 13). That might be why P students voiced their opinions more strongly on the inappropriateness of their school English books than LP and MP students. The findings revealed that P students regarded the books as not offering a standard level. They had stronger confidence in their right to ask for information in the educational system. However, LP and MP students were neutral concerning the quality of the books. Instead, they blamed teachers for not teaching efficiently and effectively.

In their positioning as legitimate participants, LP and MP students wished other students listened to them when they spoke English in class, while P students did not care. This result is consistent with Stephens et al.'s (2014) study in that middle-class contexts foster students' ability to influence their social contexts to express personal preferences.

Concerning the capital section, all the three groups highly supported access to different resources, like economic, social, cultural, symbolic, and linguistic, to invest in learning. Despite the hard economic times in the country, LP, MP, and P students highly supported the need for English learning as a gateway to academic opportunities, the most desired one. Cultural capital was the priority for the three groups to achieve. This finding supports Bourdieu's (1991) work which treated cultural, social, and symbolic capital as translatable into economics, where students benefit from educational opportunities to elevate their material circumstances. Furthermore, Bearse and de Jong (2008) stated that the learner perceives bilingualism as affordances to pave the way for job opportunities.

For MP and P students, limited language proficiency negatively affected their ambitions. For LP, however, limited language proficiency had no

relationship with ambitions. MP and P may regard language proficiency as a means to an end. This issue needs to be investigated further.

Research Question 2

Concerning the perceived investment needs of the three groups, the second question investigated the differences among the groups. The statistical analysis of the results revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the three groups in their perception of investment needs. However, the analysis of the items representative of identity did not show significant differences between the LP, MP, and P students. Concerning ideology and capital, statistically significant differences were observed between the groups. The differences between (P & MP) and (P & LP) regarding ideology and capital perceived needs were statistically significant, whereas the difference between the MP and LP was not statistically significant.

The three groups of LP, MP, and P had chosen their perceived needs differently regarding investment in English language learning under the influence of positioning and being positioned, systematic patterns of control, and different forms of capital. Students' commitment to learning was closely tied to policy makers' decisions, school settings, teachers, and parents (Aries & Seider, 2007). The LP, MP, and P students were conscious of their privileges, which affected their perceived needs. This finding is in line with that of Aries and Seider (2007), who contended that privileged students are all aware of their educational benefits, which help them in pursuing their interests.

The non-significant difference between the groups in the identity section may verify the concept of identity similarity introduced by Hohman et al.

(2016). Identity similarity is defined as the extent to which norms, values, and goals of an individual are similar to members of a group. Policymakers provide certain identification for students, and school settings purposefully develop this identification and consequently affect students' aspirations in the same way (Aries & Seider, 2007). This is how our study's LP, MP, and P students perceived their needs.

Significant differences between the groups' perceived needs concerning ideology and capital reveal that power and privilege influence choice (Aries & Seider, 2007). It seems that LP, MP, and P students cope differently with challenges caused by power relations. This discrepancy affects their discerning of needs. Furthermore, P students' significant difference from the other two groups in terms of ideology and capital underscores that school settings maintain the privilege of those in power; the privileged are supported by the resources that give them the right of the legitimate students (Howard, 2008). Our finding in this regard is also consistent with Darwin and Norton's (2015) case studies.

Conclusion

The present study addressed LP, MP, and P students' perceived needs to enhance investment at the intersection of identity, ideology, and capital. It showed that social class status strongly affected students' lived experiences in language learning education. Also, it revealed that school settings play significant roles in reinforcing social distance and social mobility in society and affect students' investment or disinvestment in language learning. Schools, as the places where students spend most of their time, shape students' lives socially, economically, and culturally; therefore, they are expected to reduce the differences between students. Concerning ideology and capital in

this study, the schools seem to enhance social class inequalities between P students and the other two groups (LP & MP). Moreover, schools maintain upward social mobility for LP students to reduce the gap between LP and MP regarding ideology and capital issues.

Our students invest in learning to reach the purpose of positioning themselves as legitimate participants in educational settings. Therefore, their perceived needs are required to be negotiated through the lens of legitimization. Legitimization may occur through the ability to participate in decision-making processes (Suchman, 1995). One way of gaining legitimacy may be the attachment of ideology and capital to the students' needs. This issue is required to be the center of attention for policymakers, school settings, and educators.

Regarding the concept of legitimacy and identity, the researchers of the present study recommend the concept of purposeful identity be added to the concept of imagined identity. Purposes create more powerful identities and lasting satisfaction due to personal fulfillment and focus on the process of learning, while desires focus on the result. It seems that focusing on the process lets learners construct a more purposeful identity and enthusiasm to achieve purposes in becoming legitimate.

Moreover, in conducting needs analysis, the concept of operating principles introduced by Kumaravadivelu (2012) is important to consider. Operating principles offer interrelatedness of the role of students, teachers, and teacher educators. The model takes educational, cultural, social, and political issues into consideration. The operating principles are considered as particularity, practicality, and possibility (Kumaravadivelu, 2012).

Implications of the Study

Based on the study findings, some pedagogical implications are suggested. The first implication is that conducting critical needs analysis provides the policymakers, school administrators, stakeholders, and language educators with deep insight into the students' perceived investment needs from different social classes. As such, sounder policies are required to make new choices about the students' perceived investment needs concerning identity, ideology, and capital. In this regard, policymakers and curriculum designers are suggested to develop English language courses that contribute to the students' goals and daily lives and elevate them to professional language speakers. The second implication is for policymakers and school administrators to link higher performance standards to schools to reduce the inequalities between LP, MP, and P schools. This way, they can facilitate students' access to different forms of capital. High-qualified teachers, improving schools' financial resources (laboratories, libraries, and computing facilities), and providing a safe and secure environment for schools are necessary factors.

Based on the findings, cultural capital was the priority for the students to achieve. Therefore, the third implication is for teachers to implement strategies that increase students' cultural capital. Also, the teachers should be informed that the students' social classes are closely tied to their levels of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991). This way, increasing students' cultural capital may reduce the gap between students' social classes. Thus, teachers need to be equipped with the required knowledge and solve challenges. The fourth implication of the findings is again for teachers. Teachers can surpass some of the restrictions that have been dictated by policymakers. They can

conduct a local needs analysis to meet students' perceived investment needs in English language learning.

In the light of the limitations imposed on the current study, some suggestions for further research are presented here. In this study, only students' perceived investment needs were investigated. Further research should be conducted to explore teachers' perceived investment needs in teaching English language learning to obtain more comprehensive findings.

References

- Aries, E., & Seider, M. (2007). The role of social class in the formation of identity: A study of public and elite private college students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 147*, 137–157. <https://doi.org/10.3200/socp.147.2.137-157>.
- Bearse, C., & de Jong, E. J. (2008). Cultural and linguistic investment: Adolescents in a secondary two-way immersion program. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*(3), 325–340.
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for Academic Purposes: Theory, Politics, and Practice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information, 16*(6), 645-668.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp.241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Brindley, G.P. (1984). *Needs analysis and objective setting in the adult migrant education program*. Sydney, Australia: N.S.W. Adult Migrant Education Service.

- Crowther, D. (2019). Language investment during university adjustment: The divergent path of international Chinese freshmen. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 19(4), 1-16. DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2019.1672075.
- Cummins, J. (2006). Identity texts: The imaginative construction of self through multi-literacies pedagogy. In O. Garcia, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. Torres-Guman (eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization* (pp. 51–68). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Darvin, R. (2016). Language and identity in the digital age. In S. Preece (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of language and identity*, (pp. 523–540). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2014). Transnational identity and migrant language learners: The promise of digital storytelling. *Education Matters: The Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 55–66.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36-56.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2016). Investment and language learning in the 21st century. *Language et Société*, 157(3), 19-38. doi: 10.3917/ls.157.0019.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2018). Identity, investment, and TESOL. In S. Nero & J. Liantas (Eds.), *Sociocultural aspects of English language teaching, The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*. New York: Wiley.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 43–59.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009). *Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Early, M., & Norton, B. (2014). Revisiting English as the medium of instruction in rural African classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(7), 1–18.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage.
- Fernsten, L. A. (2008). Writer identity and ESL learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 52(1), 44-52.
- Haneda, M. (2005). Investing in foreign-language writing: A study of two multicultural learners. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4(4), 269–290.

- Hohman, Z. P., Dahl, E., & Grubbs, S. (2016). Entitativity and social identity complexity: The relationship between group characteristics and personal characteristics on group identification. *Self and Identity*, 15(6), 638–649. DOI:10.1080/15298868.2016.1185462.
- Howard, A. (2008). *Learning privilege: Lessons of power and identity in affluent schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Jost, J.T., Pelham, B.W., Sheldon, O., & Sullivan, B. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 1-24.
- Karimifard, H. (2012). Constructivism, national identity, and foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. *Asian Social Science*, 8(2), 239-246.
- Khatib, M., & SamadiBahrami, H. (2013). Multicultural personality traits developed in an EFL context: The case of Iranian EFL students at BA, MA, and Ph.D. Levels. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, 16(2), 53-81.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. NY & UK: Routledge.
- Lindell, L. (2020). Battle of the classes: news consumption inequalities and symbolic boundary work. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 37(5), 480-496. DOI: 10.1080/15295036.2020.1829670
- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. L. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard educational review*, 66(3), 577–609.
- Nation, I.S.P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. NY: Routledge.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Essex: Pearson.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B. (2015). Identity, investment, and faces of English internationally. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 38 (4), 1-17.
- Norton, B. (2016). Identity and language learning: Back to the future. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 475-479.

- Norton, B., & Williams, C. J. (2012). Digital identities, student investments, and e Granary as a placed resource. *Language and Education*, 26(4), 315–329.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Ollerhead, S. (2012). "Passivity" or "Potential"? Teacher responses to learner identity in the low-level ESL classroom. *Literacy and Numeracy Studies*, 20(1), 1–13.
- Pittaway, D. S. (2004). Investment and second language acquisition. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1(4), 203–218.
- Potowski, K. (2004). Student Spanish use and investment in a dual immersion classroom: Implications for second language acquisition and heritage language maintenance. *The modern Language Journal*, 88(1), 75–101.
- Saboori, F., Pishghadam, R., Hosseini Fatemi, A., & Ghonsooli, B. (2015). Culture and identity: Linking Iranian identity components and cultural dimension. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 4(1), 49-78. DOI: 10.22054/ilt.2015.3463.
- SamadiBahrami, A. H. (2013). Personality development using investment in L2 and its impact on EFL proficiency: A survey of Iranian MA EFL students. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 5(3), 83-105.
- Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2002). Should I stay, or should I go? Investigating Cambodian women's participation and investment in adult ESL programs. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 53(1), 9–26.
- Soltanian, N., Ghapanchi, Z., Rezaei, S., & Pishghadam, R. (2018). Quantifying investment in language learning: Model and questionnaire development and validation in the Iranian context. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 7(1), 25-56.
- Soltanian, N., Ghapanchi, Z., & Pishghadam, R. (2018). Investment in L2 learning among Iranian English language learners. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 37(3), 131-168.
- Soltanian, N., Ghapanchi, Z., & Pishghadam, R. (2020). Language learners' imagined communities: Model and questionnaire development in the Iranian context. *Applied research on the English Language*, 9(2), 155-182.
- SoodmandAfshar, H., & Yousefi, M. (2019). Do EFL teachers 'critically' engage in cultural awareness? A mixed-method investigation. *Journal of intercultural communication Research*, 48(4), 315- 340.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Stephens, N. M., Markus, H. R., & Phillips, L. T. (2014). Social class culture cycles: How three gateway contexts shape selves and fuel inequality? *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 611–634.
- Sung, C. C. M. (2019). Investments and identities across contexts: A case study of a Hong Kong undergraduate student's L2 learning experiences. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 18(3), 1-15.
 DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2018.1552149.
- Teng, F. (2018). Learner identity and learners' investment in EFL learning: A multiple case study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 7(1), 43-60.
- Vasilopoulos, G. (2015). Language learner investment and identity negotiation in the Korean EFL context. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 14(2), 61-79.
 DOI:10.1080/15348458.2015.1019783.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. London: Blackwell.
- Wu, H. (2017). Imagined identities and investment in L2 Learning. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 14(2), 101-133.

Appendix A. Learners Needs Analysis Questionnaire

Dear language learner,

You are respectfully invited to participate in this needs analysis research. The aim is to explore high school learners' opinions on their needs to enhance investment in English language learning. Please tick (√) the relevant choice for each question.

- A. Before answering the questionnaire items, please complete the following information.

Gender→Male Female Grade→ 10th 11th 12th
Age School District

B.

	Items	Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Identity (imagination and learners' desires for belonging and recognition) (Identity construction and promotion) (Manifestation of Multiple, dynamic and evolving nature of identity) (Language learners' agency)	1. I need English to be an international student living in an English speaking country (e.g., America). 2. I need English to speak fluently and accurately. 3. I need English to read English books. 4. I need English to watch English movies. 5. I need English to listen to English songs. 6. I need English to write on social media networks.					

INVESTIGATING INVESTMENT IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

	Items	Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	7. I need English to be a professional language speaker. 8. I need English to have westernized habits. 9. I need English to have a hybrid identity (national and international). 10. I need my teacher to connect English exercises to my daily life. 11. I need English to communicate with native speakers in virtual world properly. 12. I need English exercises that match my goals. 13. I need English to be a highly educated person. 14. English helps me to change as a person (e.g. in personality). 15. English helps me to think differently. 16. English helps me to become confident. 17. I take responsibility for					

	Items	Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	my English language learning.					
Ideology (Marginalization, Non-participation and resistance in language classroom or outside) (Trying to attain a legitimate membership (moving from peripherality to legitimacy)	18. I need English to feel powerful. 19. I need English because it gives me the voice to be heard (I can use it to express my ideas globally). 20. I need English to search on English websites to be able to talk about English subjects in the class. 21. I need to be in an English course because it is a requirement. 22. I need English just to do the exercises in the textbook. 23. I need English just to pass the exams. 24. I need my teacher to change the topics of the book to more interesting topics. 25. I need to use English actively in class.					

INVESTIGATING INVESTMENT IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

	Items	Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	26. I need to be known as a good language learner or I will withdraw from the class. 27. I need others to listen to me when I speak English in class. 28. I dislike English classes in which the teacher forces us what, when, and how to do activities. 29. I dislike my English book. 30. In English class, I experience a greater degree of freedom in learning. 31. I get nervous when I speak English in class. 32. I feel afraid of looking stupid in English classes because of the mistakes I make. 33. My teachers' frequent negative feedbacks on my speaking have made me prefer not to speak in language classes.					

INVESTIGATING INVESTMENT IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

	Items	Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	34. Proficient learners in class improve my learning. 35. I feel nervous to use technology to learn English. 36. The teacher should provide an equal chance for all class members to speak to learn better. 37. My teacher appreciates cooperative working. 38. My teacher teaches us according to the book. 39. My teacher consults with us in creating rules. 40. My teacher gives us a chance to improve our bad marks.					
Capital Access to Different forms of capitals (economic,	41. I need English to make more money. 42. I need English to access social networks for my education.					

	Items	Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
cultural, social, linguistic and symbolic)	43. I need English to have native English-speaker friends in the future. 44. I think learning the English language and speaking it is ridiculous. 45. I see learning English as a betrayal of Iranian culture and identity. 46. My limited language proficiency reduces my ambitions. 47. If I am fully involved in-class activities, I can improve. 48. I see English as a gate way to academic opportunities. 49. I like cooperative working in class. 50. I need English to communicate with foreigners. 51. I need English to gain job opportunities.					

	Items	Strongly agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	52. I need English to gain social prestige. 53. I need to have access to English language learning resources (listening files, movies, and songs).					

C. What are the difficulties you face in your English class regarding books, teacher, and school?