



## NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

**Fatma Karaman<sup>i</sup>**

Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University,  
Department of German Language Teaching,  
Turkey

### **Abstract:**

The aim of grammar teaching in foreign language learning process is to teach the foreign language itself rather than the formal features of the language by ensuring the use of target language. However, German grammar courses in Turkey provide intensive training on grammar subjects. The textbooks also contain a very detailed list of grammatical subjects and terms. Therefore, in order to communicate in a language, it is not necessary to know all the phonological, semantic and syntactic features of the language in detail. In this context, the aim of this study is to determine the linguistic structures that pre-service German teachers need to use German effectively in four basic language skills and to determine the frequency of their use. In addition, it was investigated whether the linguistic structure needs were met with the resources they used in the course, for what skills they needed to use grammatical structures the most, whether they needed the subjects they studied in the grammar class in real life language use situations, and whether there were any grammar subjects they found unnecessary to teach. It was also examined whether these needs differed according to the class level and the variables of being born and growing up abroad. For this purpose, two measuring instruments, grammatical structure usage frequency questionnaire form and grammatical structure need analysis structured interview form prepared by the researcher were used. As a result of the research, it was determined that the prospective German teachers almost never use structures such as *das Perfekt der Modalverben*, *das Futur II*, *konzessive*, *konsekutive*, *modale Nebensätze*, *Finalsätze*, *Interrogativsätze*, *Zustandpassiv*. According to these findings, the grammatical structures needed by German pre-service teachers to use the language effectively were sorted according to their importance and priorities in line with the opinions of pre-service teachers and the structures used at high, middle and low levels were grouped. In order to improve the grammar teaching process, suggestions were made to give priority to subjects needed in order to develop communicative skills instead of the subjects not used in daily life in grammar books.

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [fatmakaraman33@gmail.com](mailto:fatmakaraman33@gmail.com)

**Keywords:** foreign language teaching, German grammar, needs analysis, four basic language skills

**Özet:**

Yabancı dil öğrenim sürecinde dilbilgisi öğretimindeki amaç dilin kullanımını sağlayarak aslında dilin biçimsel özelliklerinden ziyade yabancı dilin kendisini öğretmektir. Ancak Türkiye’de Almanca dilbilgisi derslerinde yoğun bir dilbilgisel konu öğretimi söz konusudur. Ders kitaplarında da aynı şekilde çok detaylı olarak dilbilgisel konuların ve terimlerin bir listesi yer almaktadır. Dolayısıyla bir dilde iletişim kurabilmek için söz konusu dilin ayrıntılı olarak fonolojik, semantik ve sözdizimsel bütün özelliklerini bilmek gerekli değildir. Bu bağlamda bu çalışmanın amacı Almanca öğretmen adaylarının Almanca’yı dört temel dil becerilerinde etkin bir biçimde kullanabilmek için ihtiyaç duydukları dilsel yapıları belirleyerek söz konusu yapıları ne sıklıkta kullandıklarına ilişkin bir durum tespiti yapmaktır. Bunun yanında söz konusu dilsel yapı ihtiyaçlarının derste kullandıkları kaynaklarla karşılanıp karşılanmadığı, en çok hangi becerilerde dilbilgisel yapıları kullanmaya ihtiyaç duydukları, dilbilgisi dersinde gördükleri konulara gerçek hayattaki dil kullanım durumlarında ihtiyaç duyup duymadıkları, öğretilmesini gereksiz gördükleri dilbilgisi konularının olup olmadığı araştırılmıştır. Bu ihtiyaçların sınıf düzeyine, yurt dışında doğup büyüme değişkenlerine göre farklılık gösterip göstermediği de incelenmiştir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan dilbilgisel yapı kullanım sıklığı anket formu ve dilbilgisel yapı ihtiyaç analizi yapılandırılmış görüşme formu olmak üzere iki ölçme aracı kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda Almanca öğretmen adaylarının das Perfekt der Modalverben, das Futur II, konzessive, konsekutive, modale Nebensätze, Finalsätze, Interrogativsätze, Zustandpassiv gibi yapıları neredeyse hiç kullanmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Elde edilen bulgulara göre Almanca öğretmen adaylarının dili etkin bir şekilde kullanabilmesine yönelik ihtiyaç duyduğu dilbilgisel yapılar öğretmen adaylarının görüşleri doğrultusunda önem ve önceliklerine göre sıralanarak yüksek, orta ve düşük düzeylerde kullanılan yapılar gruplandırılmıştır. Dilbilgisi öğretim sürecini iyileştirmek için dilbilgisi kitaplarında günlük hayatta kullanılmayan konuların yerine iletişimsel yetinin geliştirilmesi amacıyla ihtiyaç duyulan konulara öncelik verilmesi gibi önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** yabancı dil öğretimi, Almanca dilbilgisi, ihtiyaç analizi, dört temel dil becerileri

## 1. Introduction

In general, grammar is the formal aspect of a language that expresses the phonological, semantic, syntactic features and structure of a language (Duden, 2010: 13). But is it necessary to know all phonological, semantic and syntactic features of a language in order to communicate in that language? When it is also considered that Turkey could not

succeed at the desired level in foreign language teaching, (Acat and Demiral, 2002; Aktaş, 2005; Balcı, 1997; Balcı, 2016; Bayraktaroğlu, 2015; Çelebi, 2006) is it not enough to know the basic grammatical structures in a foreign language in order to use it effectively and therefore, to use it in four basic language skills? Or is it necessary to make this process even more unsuccessful with an intense teaching of concepts and terms by renouncing the part in order to teach the whole? This is a problem that needs to be questioned in terms of teaching German grammar. Because there is an intensive amount of grammar subjects training in German grammar classes in Turkey. During the teaching process of grammatical subjects and terms, the structural features of German as a foreign language are taught in artificial environment such as schools, regardless of whether they need to use these structures in their daily lives, work environments, official correspondence, social interactions and many other similar environments. Although grammar rules are taught very intensively in class, the students forget the structures and rules they learn in class since they can't use them in their daily language after the course process is over. The textbooks also contain a very detailed list of grammatical subjects and terms. Therefore, *"having so many grammatical terms in the textbooks causes students to confuse them and have difficulty in learning and storing them in their minds"* (Güneş, 2013: 76).

While grammar in the mother tongue is about teaching a wide range of language such as letters, sound, form, sentence structure, in the grammar of foreign language teaching, it is not necessary to provide a detailed content and form teaching as in the teaching process in native language. Because the aim of teaching grammar in the process of learning a foreign language is to teach the foreign language itself rather than the formal features of the language by ensuring the use of language. According to Güneş, the purpose of teaching grammar is for individuals to understand the language, to communicate and to develop their mental skills (2013: 72). In addition, whereas there is a natural process in learning a mother tongue, in learning a foreign language, an artificial learning environment is created and since this artificial environment is a formal school environment, affective factors such as anxiety and motivation come into play. If the content of the grammar books used in schools are predominantly designed to address the need based on language use, this will also affect motivation significantly. Because the students will realize that the structures that are not commonly used aren't detailed in the book and they will become more willing to learn. Therefore, students will have the opportunity to realize the necessity of subjects that have been converted to target behavior by considering the communication process in daily life and needs analysis.

As it is known, in traditional grammar, abstract rules such as semantic and syntactic features of language are taught rather than the use of language. However, according to Storch, in contrast to the traditional view of grammar, grammar in foreign language teaching is not about the phonological and morphological features of language; it deals with certain semantic and communicative phenomena (2009: 74). In support of Storch's view, Hoffman defines grammar as the formal systematic of a language for the expression of actions, thoughts, facts and situations and the establishment of communication (2013: 14). Hoffman and Storch therefore accept grammar as an area that

provides speaking, writing and language use. Grammar is not only knowing the rules of a language, recognizing and knowing its features; it is the set of structures necessary for the use of language.

It is accepted by many researchers that grammar has an important place in the learning of a language and is necessary for a foreign language (Köller, 1997; Steinig & Huneke 2010; Bulut, 2014; Aytaş and Çeçen, 2010). This applies to teaching German as well as other languages. However, as mentioned above, the importance of teaching grammar in a foreign language is meaningful as long as it makes it possible to use the language. Because the main purpose of teaching grammar is not to teach the rules of language, which are isolated from the content but to provide students with reading, listening, speaking and writing skills, and to enable them to use the language effectively (Göçer, 2015: 233).

In general, in grammar lessons in Turkey, the most common approach seems to be a format-focused one; it is seen that the grammar rules are intensively taught to the students and grammar is removed from its function to mediate the use of language and grammar issues are brought to the forefront (Göçer, 2015; Güven 2013; Ördek and Bolat 2016; Bağcı, Ayrancı, 2017; Karaman, 2016; İşcan and Kolukısa, 2005; Kırmızı, 2013; Can and Can, 2014; Haznedar, 2004; Peçenek, 2014; Suna and Durmuş Çelebi, 2013). Students' attention is directed to grammatical form and the subjects, the function and usage of the grammatical form are put into the background and intensive grammar subjects and terms are taught. Bredel argues that not all grammar terms and rules should be taught and that grammar rules should be passed on to the students as needed (Bredel, 2013). And Ingendahl emphasizes the importance of developing speech reflection in students rather than teaching all rules in detail (1999). Harley (1993) tells that irregular and less frequent structures that do not have communication functions require attention (As cited in Yalcın, 2013: 116) and emphasizes the less frequently needed and unused structures. As Kalfa points out, *“the goal in foreign language teaching is to enable the student to establish the correct and effective communication required in daily life with the foreign language learned. It is important that the teaching process is designed to meet this need.”* (2015: 250) Teaching the subjects in a certain order is not enough for the students to acquire language skills. *“The teacher should ensure that the students use what they’ve earned about grammar subjects in their oral and written expressions and make suggestions for that purpose. That way, students will learn grammar rules in a healthier way”* (Güven, 2013: 8). Within the framework of the European common recommendations for languages, emphasis was placed on identifying tasks, activities and processes that could meet the needs and equipment of language learners (2013: 134). For this reason, it is very important to determine the grammatical needs of the students in order to emphasize the teaching of German rather than the structural rules of German. Determining the grammatical needs of students learning German is also important in terms of determining the contents of foreign language course and grammar books to be prepared for this purpose. Therefore, needs analysis should be used to determine the students' grammatical structure needs. Needs analysis is the first step of program development. *“Needs analysis is an application to collect information about students’*

*learning needs, desires and expectations and to organize the learning environment according to this information*" (Graves, 2000; Iwai, vd, 1999; Brown, 1995; aci. Bölükbas, 2016: 22). According to Richards et al., needs analysis is the process of identifying the linguistic needs of a student or a group of students and arranging the needs in order of priority. (1992) In addition, needs assessment studies reveal whether the program targets meet the actual needs (Demirel, 2015: 69). When the concept of needs analysis is considered in foreign language teaching, it is important to identify and reveal the linguistic needs of students. Therefore, determining the language needs of students is an important step in order to make foreign language teaching efficient and to ensure the effective participation of students in educational environments (Koçer, 2013: 161).

According to Richards (2001), needs analysis can be used for many purposes in foreign language teaching. These purposes are:

- Determining whether an active course meets the needs of a potential student group,
- Determining the changes that are important in their learning according to people in a reference group,
- Gathering information about the main problems experienced by students,
- Determining the gap between what students can do and what they should do,
- Determining the needs of students, who need to use the language actively in the scope of a special field,
- Identify the linguistic competencies that a university student, a tour guide or a sales person should have to fulfill their responsibilities.

As noted by Richards above, the direction and scope of the needs analysis varies according to the demands of the target audience. The linguistic needs of a person belonging to any occupational group are not the same as the linguistic needs of a person working in the academic field. In addition, the needs may vary before and after the application of a curriculum. Therefore, it is important to determine how much language is needed and for whom. In this context, according to Graves (2000), "*needs analysis is the process of systematically and continuously gathering information about the needs and preferences of students in the context of learning a foreign language, interpreting this information and then making a decision to meet these needs*" (Aci. Çalışkan & Çangal, 2015: 311).

Richards (2005) emphasized the importance of needs analysis studies in order to take into account the needs of the target audience in the teaching process. In this context, in this study, grammatical structures needed by German teacher candidates to use language effectively were investigated. In this study, grammar issues are listed according to their importance and priorities in line with the opinions of the students. It has been examined whether these needs differ according to the class level and the variables of being born and raised abroad. In addition, it was determined which skills they need to use grammatical structures the most. It was investigated whether the linguistic structure needs were met with the resources they used in the course, whether they needed the subjects they saw in the grammar class in real life language use situations, and whether there were grammar subjects that they thought were unnecessary to teach. No other

needs analysis study for German grammar were made in Turkey. For this reason, this study is important in terms of putting grammar issues in order of importance and priority according to the opinions of prospective teachers. Therefore, the study will be able to guide the teaching process planning, curriculum design and development, material development, course mechanisms, and activity development and evaluation. In addition, it is expected that the results obtained in this study will contribute to the determination of which German structure and language patterns should be included in the German curriculum and thus to be taught, to organize the textbooks, to create resources for the students' language needs, and to organize the grammar issues in order of priority.

In this context, the research questions of the study are as follows:

- 1) What are the grammatical structures that prospective German teachers need to use the language effectively?
- 2) Do these needs vary according to the class level, the variables of birth and growth abroad?
- 3) In what skills do German teacher candidates need to use grammar structures most?
- 4) Are the linguistic needs in question met with the resources they use in the course?
- 5) Do they need the subjects they see in grammar lessons in real life language use situations?
- 6) What are the grammar subjects that they consider unnecessary to be taught?

## **2. Material and Methods**

### **2.1. Research Model**

In this study, descriptive scanning model was used to determine the grammatical structure needs of prospective teachers in the department of German Language Teaching. The descriptive screening model is a research approach that depicts the situation as it exists in the past or present, without any intervention (Karasar, 2000: 77). Therefore, in this study, an assessment was made to determine which German grammatical structures are frequently used by candidates in their daily lives.

### **2.2. Population and Sample**

The population of this research consists of undergraduate students studying in German teaching departments with English language score; the sample of the study is composed of 152 undergraduate students in the Preparatory School, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Grades at the Department of German Teaching at Çukurova University. Participants learn German at a higher level in the following classes, starting at the basic level. For better results, five groups of participants with varying German levels were selected for the study.

### **2.3. Measuring Tools**

The data of this study was obtained by using the Grammatical Structure Usage Frequency Questionnaire developed by the researcher to determine the grammatical structures that

German learners need in order to use the language effectively in their daily language use and four basic language skills. The subjects that are in the German grammar books and taught to the students in the German grammar lessons were taken into consideration while creating this questionnaire. Therefore, a total of 47 grammatical structures are included in the questionnaire form. Frequency of Grammatical Structure Use of the Questionnaire Form lists all the subjects taught in German grammar courses and asks which subjects the students need in written and oral language usage and how frequently they need them. In addition, grammatical structure needs analysis structured interview form was used to support the data obtained from the grammatical structure usage frequency questionnaire form. For this purpose, the literature was examined and an item was adapted from the "Language Needs Analysis Questionnaire" prepared by Bölükbaş and an item pool was formed by interviewing the students learning German. The grammatical structure needs analysis structured interview form, which consists of seven questions, asks the participants about whether they were born and raised abroad, what resources they use in grammar classes and whether these resources meet their needs, what skills they need to use the grammatical structure, and whether there were any subjects they found unnecessary to learn, whether they need the subjects they see in the course in real life language use situations. And in the last article, in an open-ended question they were asked about what their ideal grammar teachers would be like. The survey includes both closed-ended and open-ended research questions. Both of the measurement tools were piloted and the expressions which were not understood and caused complexity of meaning were edited. Again, the first version of both measurement tools was applied to 30 students and the necessary corrections were made according to the results obtained and the scope validity of the measurement tools from the first stage of creation was assured with an expert opinion.

#### **2.4. Data Analysis**

The data obtained from the Grammatical Structure Usage Frequency Survey Form of the study was analyzed using SPSS 22 package program. In this program, frequency and percentage distributions of data were calculated. In order to determine whether grammatical structure requirement is dependent on class level variable, non-parametric Chi-Square Independence Test was applied. *"With the Chi-Square independence test, it is statistically tested whether there is a significant relationship between the two variables or whether the data related to one variable show a significant difference according to different levels of the other variable"* (Ural & Kılıç, 2006: 264). The grammatical structure needs analysis was analyzed by structured interview form content analysis.

### **3. Results and Discussion**

#### **3.1. Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Grammatical Structure**

The frequency and percentage distributions of 47 grammatical structure data obtained from the grammatical structure usage frequency survey form are tabulated below.

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

**Table 1:** Frequency and Grade Distribution of Grammatical Structures

Grammatical structures	Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Artikel	99	63,9	48	31,0	3	1,9	2	1,3	0	0	152	100
Akkusativ	74	47,7	72	46,5	6	3,9	0	0	0	0	152	100
Dativ	69	44,5	76	49,0	7	4,5	0	0	0	0	152	100
Genitiv	42	27,1	69	44,5	25	16,1	12	7,7	4	2,6	152	100
Trennbare Verben	28	18,1	68	43,9	45	29,0	10	6,5	1	,6	152	100
Untrennbare Verben	28	18,1	63	40,6	52	33,5	8	5,2	1	,6	152	100
Imperativ	27	17,4	31	20,0	52	33,5	37	23,9	5	3,2	152	100
Präpositionen mit Akk.	29	18,7	54	34,8	58	37,4	8	5,2	3	1,9	152	100
Präpositionen mit Dativ	25	16,1	46	29,7	59	38,1	19	12,3	3	1,9	152	100
Präpositionen mit Genitiv	12	7,7	21	13,5	44	28,4	48	31,0	27	17,4	152	100
Modalverben	67	43,2	56	36,1	18	11,6	7	4,5	4	2,6	152	100
Das Präsens	118	76,1	31	20,0	1	,6	1	,6	1	,6	152	100
Das Präteritum	87	56,1	44	28,4	14	9,0	3	1,9	4	2,6	152	100
Das Perfekt	86	55,5	50	32,3	8	5,2	2	1,3	6	3,9	152	100
Perfekt der Modalverben	22	14,2	33	21,3	16	10,3	39	25,2	42	27,1	152	100
Plusquamperfekt	15	9,7	27	17,4	48	31,0	45	29,0	17	11,0	152	100
Das Futur I	42	27,1	46	29,7	26	16,8	21	13,5	17	11,0	152	100
Das Futur II	8	5,2	12	7,7	12	7,7	32	20,6	88	56,8	152	100
Konjunktionen	30	19,4	46	29,7	48	31,0	13	8,4	15	9,7	152	100
Nebensätze dass	41	26,5	64	41,3	33	21,3	10	6,5	4	2,6	152	100
Zu- infinitiv	26	16,8	61	39,4	41	26,5	16	10,3	8	5,2	152	100
Kausale Nebensätze	22	14,2	61	39,4	46	29,7	10	6,5	13	8,4	152	100
Konditionale Nebensätze	16	10,3	55	35,5	48	31,0	16	10,3	17	11,0	152	100
Temporale Nebensätze	41	26,5	46	29,7	40	25,8	10	6,5	15	9,7	152	100
Konzessive Nebensätze	8	5,2	41	26,5	52	33,5	22	14,2	29	18,7	152	100
Konsekutive Nebensätze	4	2,6	36	23,2	52	33,5	30	19,4	30	19,4	152	100
Modale Nebensätze	16	10,3	24	15,5	54	34,8	30	19,4	28	18,1	152	100
Finalsätze	14	9,0	35	22,6	51	32,9	26	16,8	26	16,8	152	100
Interrogativsätze	9	5,8	8	5,2	32	20,6	37	23,9	66	42,6	152	100
Relativsätze	72	46,5	44	28,4	23	14,8	8	5,2	5	3,2	152	100
Das Vorganspassiv	24	15,5	45	29,0	29	18,7	25	16,1	29	18,7	152	100
Das Zustandpassiv	3	1,9	14	9,0	22	14,2	41	26,5	72	46,5	152	100
Passiv bei Modalverben	7	4,5	20	12,9	50	32,3	37	23,9	37	23,9	152	100
Partizipien	8	5,2	29	18,7	56	36,1	30	19,4	29	18,7	152	100
Nominalisierung	8	5,2	29	18,7	58	37,4	24	15,5	33	21,3	152	100
Verbalisierung	9	5,8	30	19,4	50	32,3	27	17,4	36	23,2	152	100
Konjunktiv I	9	5,8	23	14,8	23	14,8	45	29,0	52	33,5	152	100
Konjunktiv II der Gegenwart	30	19,4	48	31,0	24	15,5	22	14,2	28	18,1	152	100
Konjunktiv II der Vergangenheit	32	20,6	52	33,5	22	14,2	21	13,5	25	16,1	152	100
Irreale Konditionalsätze	38	24,5	44	28,4	27	17,4	16	10,3	27	17,4	152	100
Wunschsätze	63	40,6	41	26,5	20	12,9	12	7,7	16	10,3	152	100
Adjektivdeklination	82	52,9	39	25,2	17	11,0	13	8,4	1	,6	152	100
Deklination der Adjektive als Attribute	36	23,2	51	32,9	30	19,4	20	12,9	15	9,7	152	100
Ergänzungen	10	6,5	28	18,1	65	41,9	27	17,4	22	14,2	152	100
Partizip I	11	7,1	37	23,9	54	34,8	33	21,3	17	11,0	152	100
Partizip II	4	2,6	21	13,5	44	28,4	48	31,0	35	22,6	152	100
Apposition	0	0	4	2,6	26	16,8	61	39,4	61	39,4	152	100

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of use of grammatical structures for each subject. When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that Artikel subject is always used in 63.9% (99), 1.9 (3) sometimes and 1.3 (2) rarely in 31.0% (48). In general, it is understood that Artikel is used frequently. The Akkusativ structure is always used at a rate of 47.7% (74), often at a rate of 46.5% (72), and sometimes at a rate of 3.9% (6). Dativ structure was 44.5% (69) used always, 49.0 (76) used often and 4.5% (7) used sometimes. Genitiv structure is used always 27.1% (42), 44.5% (69) frequently, 16.1% (25) sometimes, 7.7% (12) rarely, 2.6% (4) never. In general, it is seen that Artikel, Akkusativ, Dativ, Genitiv structures are used at a high rate. This result can be explained by the fact that these subjects are basic structure and compulsory to form simple sentences. Trennbare Verben structure is used at 18.1% (28) always, 43.9% (68) often, 29.0% (45) sometimes, 6.5% (10) rarely, 6 (1) never rate; untrennbare Verben structure is used at 18.1% (28) always, 40.6% (63) frequently, 33.5% (52) sometimes, 5.2% (8) rarely, 6% (1) never rate; Imperativ structure is used at 17.4% (27) always, 20.0% (31) often, 33.5% (52) sometimes, 23.9% (37) rarely, 3.2% (5) never rate; Präpositionen mit Accusative structure is used at 18.7% (29) always, 34.8% (54) often, 37.4% (58) sometimes, 5.2% (8) rarely, 1.9% (3) never rate; Präpositionen mit Dativ structure is used at 16.1% (25) always, 29.7% (46) often, 38.1% (59) sometimes, 12.3% (19) rarely, 1.9% (3) never rate which is around the middle frequency. There is a long list of verbs related to these structures in the textbooks and students are required to memorize these verbs. These structures in grammar books can be considered as vocabulary practice and are used according to need. Präpositionen mit Genitiv is used at 7.7% (12) always, 13.5% (21) frequently; 28.4% (44) sometimes, 31.0% (48) rarely, 17.4% (27) never rate, almost never used in daily communication.

Modalverbene structure is used at 43.2% (67) always, 36.1% (56) often, 11.6% (18) sometimes, 4.5% (7) rarely, 2.6% (4) never rate; das Präsens structure is used at 76.1% (118) always, 20.0% (31) often, 6%, 6 (1) sometimes, 6%, 6 (1) rarely, 6%, 6 (1) never rate; das Präteritum structure is used at 56%, 1 (87) always, 28.4% (44) often, 9.0% (14) sometimes, 1.9% (3) rarely, 2.6% (4) never rate ; das Perfekt structure is used at 55.5% (86) always, 32.3% (50) often, 5.2% (8) sometimes, 1.3% (2) rarely, 3.9% (6) never rate which is a high frequency. Modalverben structure is used by the students to express the way an action is performed; Präsens, Präteritum and Perfekt are preferred to indicate the time of the action. Because the data examined shows that das Perfekt der Modalverben structure is used at 14.2% (22) always, 21.3% (33) often, 10.3% (16) sometimes, 25.2% (39) rarely, 27.1% (42) never rate; Plusquamperfekt structure is used at 9.7% (15) always, 17.4% (27) often, 31.0% (48) sometimes, 29.0% (45) rarely, 11.0% (17) never rate; das Futur I structure is used at 27.1% (42) always, 29.7% (46) often, 16.8% (26) sometimes, 13.5% (21) rarely, 11.0% (17) never rate, das Futur II structure is used at a low level, 5.2% (8) always, 7.7% (12) often, 7.7% (12) sometimes, 20.6% (32) rarely, 56.8% (88) never rate.

Konjunktionen structure used at moderate frequency by students, at 19.4% (30) always 29.7% (46) frequently, 31.0% (48) sometimes, 8.4% (13) rarely, 9.7% (15) never rate. From this result, it is understood that students prefer to communicate with simpler sentences instead of forming long side sentences. Nebensatz dass structure is used at

26.5% (41) always, 41.3% (64) often, 21.3% (33) sometimes, 6.5% (10) rarely, 2.6% (4) never rate; zu-infinitiv structure is used at 16.8% (26) always, 39.4% (61) frequently, 26.5% (41) sometimes, 10.3% (16) rarely, 5.2% (8) never rate, which is considered a high frequency. Since these two structures can be used in both subject and object function, they are often preferred in many communication environments.

Kausale Nebensätze structure is used at 14.2% (22) always, 39.4% (61) often, 29.7% (46) sometimes, 6.5% (10) rarely, 8.4% (13) never rate; konditionale Nebensätze structure is used at 10.3% (16) always, 35.5% (55) often, 31.0% (48) sometimes, 10.3% (16) rarely, 11.0% (17) never rate; temporale Nebensätze structures are used at 26.5% (41) always, 29.7% (46) often, 25.8% (40) sometimes, 6.5% (10) rarely, 9.7% (15) never rate, which are considered high frequencies. These structures are often needed due to the use of side sentences in many communication environments reporting cause-effect, condition and time in daily life.

Konzessive Nebensätze structure is used at 5.2% (8) always, 26.5% (41) often, 33.5% (52) sometimes, 14.2% (22) rarely, 18.7% (29) never rate; konsekutive Nebensätze structure is used at 2.6% (4) always, 23.2% (36) often, 33.5% (52) sometimes, 19.4% (30) rarely, 19%, (30) never rate; Modale Nebensätze structure is used at 10.3% (16) always, 15.5% (24) often, 34.8% (54) sometimes, 19.4% (30) rarely, 18.1% (28) never rate; Finalsätze structure is used at 9.0% (14) always, 22.6% (35) often 32.9% (51) sometimes, 16.8% (26) rarely, 16.8% (26) never rate; Interrogativsätze structure is used at 5.8% (9) always, 5.2% (8) often, 20.6% (32) sometimes, 23.9% (37) rarely, 42.6% (66) never rate, which are low frequencies of use.

Relativsätze structure is used at 46.5% (72) always, 28.4% (44) often, 14.8% (23) sometimes, 5.2% (8) rarely, 3.2% (5) never rate; das Vorgangspassiv structure is used at a high frequency, at 15.5% (24) always, 29.0% (45) often, 18.7% (29) sometimes, 16.1% (25) rarely, 18.7% (29) never rate; Zustandspassiv structure is used at 1.9% (3), 9.0% (14) frequently, 14.2% (22) sometimes, 26.5% (41) rarely, 46.5% (72) never rate; das Passiv bei Modalverben structure is used at 4.5% (7) always, 12.9% (20) often, 32.3% (50) sometimes, 23.9% (37) rarely, 23.9% (37) never rate; Partizipien structure is used at 5.2% (8) always, 18.7% (29) often, 36.1% (56) sometimes, 19.4% (30) rarely, 18.7% (29) never rate, which shows it's almost never used. Nominalisierung structure is used at 5.2% (8) always, 18.7% (29) often, 37.4% (58) sometimes, 15.5% (24) rarely, 21.3% (33) never rate; Verbalisierung structure is used at 5.8% (9) all the time, 19.4% (30) frequently, 32.3% (50) sometimes, 17.4% (27) rarely, 23.2% (36) never rate, which is moderate usage.

Konjunktiv I structure is used at 5.8% (9) always, 14.8% (23) often, 14.8% (23) sometimes, 29.0% (45) rarely, 33.5% (52) never rate, so it's almost never used. Konjunktiv II der Gegenwart structure is used at 19.4% (30) always, 31.0% (48) often, 15.5% (24) sometimes, 14.2% (22) rarely, 18.1% (28) never rate; Konjunktiv II der Vergangenheit structure is used at 20.6% (32), always, 33.5% (52) often, 14.2% (22) sometimes, 13.5% (21) rarely, 16.1% (25) never rate; irreale Konditionalsätze structure is used at 24.5% (38) always, 28.4% (44) often, 17.4% (27) sometimes, 10.3% (16) rarely, 17.4% (27) ) is never rate, which is a moderate level. Wunschsätze structure is used at 40.6% (63) always, 26.5%

(41) often, 12.9% (20) sometimes, 7.7% (12) rarely, 10.3% (16) never rate; Adjektivdeklinaton structure is used at 52.9% (82) always, 25.2% (39) often, 11.0% (17) sometimes, 8.4% (13) rarely, 6% (1) never rate, which puts its usage at a high level. Deklination der Adjektive als Attribute structure is used at 23.2% (36) always, 32.9% (51) often, 19.4% (30) sometimes, 12.9% (20) rarely, 9.7% (15) never rate, which is a moderate level; Ergänzungen structure is used at 6.5% (10) always, 18.1% (28) often, 41.9% (65) sometimes, 17.4% (27) rarely, 14.2% (22) never rate, which is a very low level; Partizip I structure is used at 7.1% (11) always, 23.9% (37) often, 34.8% (54) sometimes, 21.3% (33) rarely, 11.0% (17) never rate, which intermediate usage level; Partizip II structure is used at 2.6% (4) always, 13.5% (21) often, 28.4% (44) sometimes, 31.0% (48) rarely, 22.6% (35) never rate ; Apposition structure is used at 0% (0) always, 2.6% (4) frequency, 16.8% (26) sometimes, 39.4% (61) rarely, 39.4% (61) never rate, which show it is almost never used.

The structures used at high, medium and low levels were grouped above. According to data frequently used structures are “Artikel, Akkusativ, Dativ, Genitiv, Modalverben, Präsens, Präteritum, Perfekt, Nebensatz dass, zu-infinitiv, Relativsätze, Wunschsätze, Adjektivdeklinaton, kausale, konditionale, temporale Nebensätze”; moderately used structures are “trennbare Verben, untrennbare Verben, Imperativ, Präpositionen mit Akkusativ, mit Dativ, Plusquamperfekt, Futur I, Konjunktionen, Vorgangspassiv, Nominalisierung, Verbalisierung, Konjunktiv II der Gegenwart, Konjunktiv II der Vergangenheit, irrealer Konditionalsätze, Deklination der Adjektive als Attribute, Partizip I”; and structures that are almost never used are “mperativ, Präpositionen mit Genitiv, das Perfekt der Modalverben, das Futur II, konzessive, konsekutive, modale Nebensätze, Finalsätze, Interrogativsätze, Zustandspassiv, das Passiv bei Modalverben, Partizipien, Konjunktiv I, Ergänzungen, Partizip II ve Apposition.” When the structures used at high level are examined, it is understood that these structures are also commonly used in daily and written language and communication environments. Since the structures used at low level are the ones that do not correspond in real life for the students, it is difficult for the students to learn these structures permanently.

### 3.2. Grammatical Structure Needs in the Context of Class Level

The chi-square independence test was used to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the students' grammatical needs in terms of grade level. A chi-square value less than 0.05 indicates a differentiation between the groups, whereas a chi-square value greater than 0.05 indicates no differentiation.

**Table 2:** Chi-Square Independence Test Results to Determine if Grammatical Structure Needs Dependent on Class Level Variable

Grammatical structures	Grade	Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Chi-Square	P score
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Artikel												14,040	,298
	Pre-class	24	24,2	7	14,6	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	14	14,1	7	14,6	2	66,7	1	50,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	16	16,2	9	18,8	1	33,3	1	50,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	27	27,3	13	27,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	4th grade	18	18,2	12	25,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Akkusativ		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	16	21,6	14	19,4	1	16,7	0	0,0	0	0,0	19,619	,012
	1st grade	9	12,2	14	19,4	1	16,7	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	8	10,8	15	20,8	4	66,7	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	27	36,5	13	18,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	4th grade	14	18,9	16	22,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Dativ		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	16	23,2	14	18,4	1	14,3	0	0,0	0	0,0	15,162	,056
	1st grade	8	11,6	14	18,4	2	28,6	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	8	11,6	15	19,7	4	57,1	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	23	33,3	17	22,4	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	4th grade	14	20,3	16	21,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Genitiv		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	9	21,4	13	18,8	8	32,0	1	8,3	0	0,0	31,643	,011
	1st grade	6	14,3	14	20,3	2	8,0	2	16,7	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	5	11,9	10	14,5	7	28,0	2	16,7	3	75,0		
	3rd grade	13	31,0	20	29,0	6	24,0	0	0,0	1	25,0		
	4th grade	9	21,4	12	17,4	2	8,0	7	58,3	0	0,0		
Trennbare Verben		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	4	14,3	11	16,2	15	33,3	1	10,0	0	0,0	25,837	,056
	1st grade	5	17,9	7	10,3	8	17,8	3	30,0	1	100,		
	2nd grade	4	14,3	10	14,7	9	20,0	4	40,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	10	35,7	23	33,8	7	15,6	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	4th grade	5	17,9	17	25,0	6	13,3	2	20,0	0	0,0		
Untrennbare Verben		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	5	17,9	12	19,0	13	25,0	1	12,5	0	0,0	22,718	,121

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	5	17,9	6	9,5	9	17,3	4	50,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	4	14,3	9	14,3	11	21,2	2	25,0	1	100,0		
	3rd grade	5	17,9	22	34,9	12	23,1	1	12,5	0	0,0		
	4th grade	9	32,1	14	22,2	7	13,5	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Imperativ		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	3	11,1	7	22,6	12	23,1	8	21,6	1	20,0		
	1st grade	2	7,4	3	9,7	12	23,1	5	13,5	2	40,0		
	2nd grade	4	14,8	5	16,1	12	23,1	4	10,8	2	40,0		
	3rd grade	14	51,9	10	32,3	8	15,4	8	21,6	0	0,0		
	4th grade	4	14,8	6	19,4	8	15,4	12	32,4	0	0,0		
Präpositionen mit Akkusativ		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	5	17,2	12	22,2	13	22,4	1	12,5	0	0,0		
	1st grade	4	13,8	8	14,8	8	13,8	2	25,0	2	66,7		
	2nd grade	4	13,8	6	11,1	15	25,9	2	25,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	9	31,0	18	33,3	9	15,5	3	37,5	1	33,3		
	4th grade	7	24,1	10	18,5	13	22,4	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Präpositionen mit Dativ		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	2	8,0	14	30,4	14	23,7	1	5,3	0	0,0		
	1st grade	4	16,0	9	19,6	7	11,9	3	15,8	1	33,3		
	2nd grade	4	16,0	5	10,9	14	23,7	3	15,8	1	33,3		
	3rd grade	10	40,0	10	21,7	11	18,6	8	42,1	1	33,3		
	4th grade	5	20,0	8	17,4	13	22,0	4	21,1	0	0,0		
Präpositionen mit Genitiv		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	2	16,7	7	33,3	18	40,9	3	6,3	1	3,7		
	1st grade	3	25,0	10	47,6	5	11,4	4	8,3	2	7,4		
	2nd grade	3	25,0	1	4,8	13	29,5	6	12,5	4	14,8		
	3rd grade	2	16,7	3	14,3	4	9,1	24	50,0	7	25,9		
	4th grade	2	16,7	0	0,0	4	9,1	11	22,9	13	48,1		
Modalverben		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	10	14,9	11	19,6	7	38,9	3	42,9	0	0,0		
												26,424	,048
												18,284	,308
												17,924	,328
												78,300	,000

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	9	13,4	9	16,1	4	22,2	1	14,3	1	25,0	24,713	,075
	2nd grade	8	11,9	15	26,8	4	22,2	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	26	38,8	11	19,6	1	5,6	1	14,3	1	25,0		
	4th grade	14	20,9	10	17,9	2	11,1	2	28,6	2	50,0		
Das Präsens		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	23,077	,112
	Pre-class	21	17,8	9	29,0	1	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	1st grade	20	16,9	3	9,7	0	0,0	1	100,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	19	16,1	8	25,8	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	37	31,4	2	6,5	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	100,0		
	4th grade	21	17,8	9	29,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Das Präteritum		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	35,695	,003
	Pre-class	10	11,5	14	31,8	5	35,7	1	33,3	1	25,0		
	1st grade	15	17,2	4	9,1	3	21,4	1	33,3	1	25,0		
	2nd grade	14	16,1	10	22,7	2	14,3	0	0,0	1	25,0		
	3rd grade	36	41,4	3	6,8	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	25,0		
	4th grade	12	13,8	13	29,5	4	28,6	1	33,3	0	0,0		
Das Perfekt		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	42,262	,000
	Pre-class	11	12,8	17	34,0	2	25,0	0	0,0	1	16,7		
	1st grade	16	18,6	5	10,0	3	37,5	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	14	16,3	8	16,0	3	37,5	2	100,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	32	37,2	5	10,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	3	50,0		
	4th grade	13	15,1	15	30,0	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	33,3		
Das Perfekt der Modalverben		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	60,897	,000
	Pre-class	4	18,2	14	42,4	4	25,0	9	23,1	0	0,0		
	1st grade	8	36,4	4	12,1	8	50,0	2	5,1	2	4,8		
	2nd grade	3	13,6	6	18,2	3	18,8	8	20,5	7	16,7		
	3rd grade	3	13,6	6	18,2	1	6,3	11	28,2	19	45,2		
Plusquamperfekt		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	22,295	,134
	Pre-class	4	26,7	6	22,2	7	14,6	10	22,2	4	23,5		

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	6	40,0	4	14,8	9	18,8	4	8,9	1	5,9		
	2nd grade	2	13,3	4	14,8	6	12,5	11	24,4	4	23,5		
	3rd grade	3	20,0	10	37,0	13	27,1	12	26,7	2	11,8		
	4th grade	0	0,0	3	11,1	13	27,1	8	17,8	6	35,3		
Das Futur I		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	5	11,9	2	4,3	3	11,5	10	47,6	11	64,7		
	1st grade	8	19,0	3	6,5	7	26,9	5	23,8	1	5,9		
	2nd grade	5	11,9	13	28,3	6	23,1	3	14,3	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	18	42,9	12	26,1	6	23,1	1	4,8	3	17,6		
	4th grade	6	14,3	16	34,8	4	15,4	2	9,5	2	11,8		
Das Futur II		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	1	12,5	2	16,7	1	8,3	5	15,6	22	25,0		
	1st grade	3	37,5	4	33,3	4	33,3	9	28,1	4	4,5		
	2nd grade	0	0,0	0	0,0	6	50,0	6	18,8	15	17,0		
	3rd grade	2	25,0	2	16,7	1	8,3	7	21,9	28	31,8		
	4th grade	2	25,0	4	33,3	0	0,0	5	15,6	19	21,6		
Konjunktionen		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	6	20,0	6	13,0	11	22,9	2	15,4	6	40,0		
	1st grade	4	13,3	5	10,9	9	18,8	3	23,1	3	20,0		
	2nd grade	7	23,3	4	8,7	13	27,1	1	7,7	2	13,3		
	3rd grade	5	16,7	16	34,8	13	27,1	4	30,8	2	13,3		
	4th grade	8	26,7	15	32,6	2	4,2	3	23,1	2	13,3		
Nebensätze dass		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	5	12,2	8	12,5	12	36,4	4	40,0	2	50,0		
	1st grade	2	4,9	8	12,5	8	24,2	4	40,0	2	50,0		
	2nd grade	7	17,1	10	15,6	9	27,3	1	10,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	18	43,9	20	31,3	1	3,0	1	10,0	0	0,0		
	4th grade	9	22,0	18	28,1	3	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Zu- infinitiv		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	1	3,8	6	9,8	12	29,3	5	31,3	7	87,5		

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	1	3,8	8	13,1	9	22,0	5	31,3	1	12,5		
	2nd grade	3	11,5	7	11,5	12	29,3	5	31,5	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	16	61,5	20	32,8	3	7,3	1	6,3	0	0,0		
	4th grade	5	19,2	20	32,8	5	12,2	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Kausale Nebensätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	24,969	,070
	Pre-class	4	18,2	8	13,1	11	23,9	3	30,0	5	38,5		
	1st grade	2	9,1	6	9,8	8	17,4	2	20,0	6	46,2		
	2nd grade	4	18,2	10	16,4	10	21,7	2	20,0	1	7,7		
	3rd grade	7	31,8	22	36,1	9	19,6	1	10,0	1	7,7		
	4th grade	5	22,7	15	24,6	8	17,4	2	20,0	0	0,0		
Konditionale Nebensätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	63,212	,000
	Pre-class	2	12,5	5	9,1	10	20,8	3	18,8	11	64,7		
	1st grade	0	0,0	4	7,3	11	22,9	4	25,0	5	29,4		
	2nd grade	0	0,0	11	20,0	12	25,0	4	25,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	6	37,5	24	43,6	8	16,7	1	6,3	1	5,9		
	4th grade	8	50,0	11	20,0	7	14,6	4	25,0	0	0,0		
Temporale Nebensätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	59,597	,000
	Pre-class	4	9,8	6	13,0	8	20,0	3	30,0	10	66,7		
	1st grade	2	4,9	3	6,5	12	30,0	3	30,0	4	26,7		
	2nd grade	4	9,8	13	28,3	8	20,0	2	20,0	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	15	36,6	16	34,8	7	17,5	1	10,0	1	6,7		
	4th grade	16	39,0	8	17,4	5	12,5	1	10,0	0	0,0		
Konzessive Nebensätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	62,870	,000
	Pre-class	0	0,0	1	2,4	6	11,5	5	22,7	19	65,5		
	1st grade	0	0,0	5	12,2	10	19,2	4	18,2	5	17,2		
	2nd grade	3	37,5	8	19,5	11	21,2	4	18,2	1	3,4		
	3rd grade	5	62,5	15	36,6	13	25,0	5	22,7	2	6,9		
	4th grade	0	0,0	12	29,3	12	23,1	4	18,2	2	6,9		
Konsekutive Nebensätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	80,979	,000
	Pre-class	0	0,0	1	2,8	3	5,8	7	23,3	20	66,7		

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	2	50,0	3	8,3	7	13,5	5	16,7	7	23,3		
	2nd grade	2	50,0	5	13,9	15	28,8	4	13,3	1	3,3		
	3rd grade	0	0,0	17	47,2	12	23,1	9	30,0	2	6,7		
	4th grade	0	0,0	10	27,8	15	28,8	5	16,7	0	0,0		
Modale Nebensätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	2	12,5	2	8,3	7	13,0	7	23,3	13	46,4		
	1st grade	4	25,0	5	20,8	8	14,8	2	6,7	5	17,9		
	2nd grade	4	25,0	6	25,0	9	16,7	6	20,0	2	7,1		
	3rd grade	6	37,5	5	20,8	17	31,5	8	26,7	4	14,3		
	4th grade	0	0,0	6	25,0	13	24,1	7	23,3	4	14,3		
Finalsätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	0	0,0	1	2,9	6	11,8	9	34,6	15	57,7		
	1st grade	0	0,0	7	20,0	9	17,6	1	3,8	7	26,9		
	2nd grade	5	35,7	8	22,9	9	17,6	5	19,2	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	5	35,7	11	31,4	13	25,5	7	26,9	4	15,4		
	4th grade	4	28,6	8	22,9	14	27,5	4	15,4	0	0,0		
Interrogativsätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	2	22,2	0	0,0	1	3,1	10	27,0	18	27,3		
	1st grade	2	22,2	2	25,0	8	25,0	6	16,2	6	9,1		
	2nd grade	2	22,2	3	37,5	11	34,4	9	24,3	2	3,0		
	3rd grade	2	22,2	3	37,5	10	31,3	7	18,9	18	27,3		
	4th grade	1	11,1	0	0,0	2	6,3	5	13,5	22	33,3		
Relativsätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	5	6,9	6	13,6	12	52,2	4	50,0	4	80,0		
	1st grade	14	19,4	5	11,4	3	13,0	2	25,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	15	20,8	6	13,6	5	21,7	1	12,5	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	26	36,1	11	25,0	2	8,7	1	12,5	0	0,0		
	4th grade	12	16,7	16	36,4	1	4,3	0	0,0	1	20,0		
Das Vorgangspassiv		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	1	4,2	0	0,0	3	10,3	8	32,0	19	65,5		
												26,861	,043
												54,775	,000
												42,009	,000
												53,525	,000
												104,260	,000

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	2	8,3	3	6,7	7	24,1	6	24,0	6	20,7		
	2nd grade	2	8,3	4	8,9	11	37,9	7	28,0	3	10,3		
	3rd grade	12	50,0	19	42,2	4	13,8	4	16,0	1	3,4		
	4th grade	7	29,2	19	42,2	4	13,8	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Das Zustandspassiv		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
	Pre-class	0	0,0	3	21,4	3	13,6	6	14,6	19	26,4	30,476	,016
	1st grade	1	33,3	4	28,6	6	27,3	5	12,2	8	11,1		
	2nd grade	1	33,3	1	7,1	9	40,9	10	24,4	6	8,3		
	3rd grade	1	33,3	4	28,6	4	18,2	13	31,7	18	25,0		
	4th grade	0	0,0	2	14,3	0	0,0	7	17,1	21	29,2		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%			
Das Passiv bei Modalverben	Pre-class	3	42,9	6	30,0	8	16,0	7	18,9	7	18,9	49,611	,000
	1st grade	2	28,6	5	25,0	9	18,0	5	13,5	2	5,4		
	2nd grade	1	14,3	0	0,0	10	20,0	12	32,4	4	10,8		
	3rd grade	0	0,0	0	0,0	12	24,0	8	21,6	20	54,1		
	4th grade	1	14,3	9	45,0	11	22,0	5	13,5	4	10,8		
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Partizipien	Pre-class	2	25,0	3	10,3	4	7,1	4	13,3	18	62,1	55,522	,000
	1st grade	1	12,5	4	13,8	12	21,4	5	16,7	2	6,9		
	2nd grade	1	12,5	1	3,4	14	25,0	9	30,0	2	6,9		
	3rd grade	4	50,0	11	37,9	15	26,8	6	20,0	4	13,8		
	4th grade	0	0,0	10	34,5	11	19,6	6	20,0	3	10,3		
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Nominalisierung	Pre-class	2	25,0	0	0,0	4	6,9	6	25,0	19	57,6	59,598	,000
	1st grade	2	25,0	2	6,9	9	15,5	6	25,0	5	15,2		
	2nd grade	3	37,5	8	27,6	12	20,7	3	12,5	1	3,0		
	3rd grade	0	0,0	14	48,3	16	27,6	6	25,0	4	12,1		
	4th grade	1	12,5	5	17,2	17	29,3	3	12,5	4	12,1		
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Verbalisierung	Pre-class	2	22,2	0	0,0	4	8,0	6	22,2	19	52,8	50,726	,000
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	1	11,1	2	6,7	9	18,0	7	25,9	5	13,9		
	2nd grade	4	44,4	9	30,0	9	18,0	4	14,8	1	2,8		
	3rd grade	1	11,1	12	40,0	14	28,0	6	22,2	7	19,4		
	4th grade	1	11,1	7	23,3	14	28,0	4	14,8	4	11,1		
Konjunktiv I		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	42,883	,000
	Pre-class	2	22,2	3	13,0	4	17,4	5	11,1	17	32,7		
	1st grade	3	33,3	9	39,1	7	30,4	1	2,2	4	7,7		
	2nd grade	3	33,3	5	21,7	5	21,7	9	20,0	5	9,6		
	3rd grade	1	11,1	5	21,7	5	21,7	15	33,3	14	26,9		
	4th grade	0	0,0	1	4,3	2	8,7	15	33,3	12	23,1		
Konjunktiv II der Gegenwart		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	101,168	,000
	Pre-class	1	3,3	0	0,0	4	16,7	5	22,7	21	75,0		
	1st grade	2	6,7	5	10,4	8	33,3	5	22,7	4	14,3		
	2nd grade	2	6,7	10	20,8	6	25,0	7	31,8	2	7,1		
	3rd grade	15	50,0	18	37,5	4	16,7	3	13,6	0	0,0		
	4th grade	10	33,3	15	31,3	2	8,3	2	9,1	1	3,6		
Konjunktiv II der Vergangenheit		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	121,534	,000
	Pre-class	1	3,1	1	1,9	3	13,6	6	28,6	20	80,0		
	1st grade	3	9,4	4	7,7	9	40,9	5	23,8	3	12,0		
	2nd grade	1	3,1	10	19,2	6	27,3	8	38,1	2	8,0		
	3rd grade	16	50,0	20	38,5	2	9,1	2	9,5	0	0,0		
	4th grade	11	34,4	17	32,7	2	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Irreale Konditionalsätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	116,252	,000
	Pre-class	0	0,0	0	0,0	4	14,8	7	43,8	20	74,1		
	1st grade	2	5,3	7	15,9	9	33,3	2	12,5	4	14,8		
	2nd grade	5	13,2	8	18,2	5	18,5	6	37,5	3	11,1		
	3rd grade	23	60,5	12	27,3	5	18,5	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	4th grade	8	21,1	17	38,6	4	14,8	1	6,3	0	0,0		
Wunschsätze		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	113,732	,000
	Pre-class	2	3,2	3	7,3	5	25,0	9	75,0	12	75,0		

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	4	6,3	7	17,1	9	45,0	1	8,3	3	18,8		
	2nd grade	16	25,4	5	12,2	3	15,0	2	16,7	1	6,3		
	3rd grade	30	47,6	8	19,5	2	10,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
	4th grade	11	17,5	18	43,9	1	5,0	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Adjektivdeklinaton		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	44,592	,000
	Pre-class	6	7,3	13	33,3	7	41,2	4	30,8	1	100,0		
	1st grade	7	8,5	7	17,9	6	35,3	4	30,8	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	19	23,2	5	12,8	0	0,0	3	23,1	0	0,0		
	3rd grade	25	30,5	10	25,6	3	17,6	2	15,4	0	0,0		
	4th grade	25	30,5	4	10,3	1	5,9	0	0,0	0	0,0		
Deklination der Adjektive als Attribute		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	59,904	,000
	Pre-class	1	2,8	7	13,7	6	20,0	7	35,0	10	66,7		
	1st grade	4	11,1	8	15,7	8	26,7	4	20,0	0	0,0		
	2nd grade	12	33,3	9	17,6	3	10,0	2	10,0	1	6,7		
	3rd grade	5	13,9	14	27,5	13	43,3	6	30,0	2	13,3		
	4th grade	14	38,9	13	25,5	0	0,0	1	5,0	2	13,3		
Ergänzungen		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	47,254	,000
	Pre-class	3	30,0	2	7,1	10	15,4	4	14,8	12	54,5		
	1st grade	2	20,0	10	35,7	5	7,7	3	11,1	4	18,2		
	2nd grade	4	40,0	7	25,0	11	16,9	4	14,8	1	4,5		
	3rd grade	0	0,0	7	25,0	19	29,2	11	40,7	3	13,6		
	4th grade	1	10,0	2	7,1	20	30,8	5	18,5	2	9,1		
Partizip I		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	12,830	,685
	Pre-class	3	27,3	4	10,8	10	18,5	7	21,2	7	41,2		
	1st grade	1	9,1	8	21,6	7	13,0	4	12,1	4	23,5		
	2nd grade	3	27,3	7	18,9	11	20,4	5	15,2	1	5,9		
	3rd grade	3	27,3	11	29,7	15	27,8	9	27,3	2	11,8		
	4th grade	1	9,1	7	18,9	11	20,4	8	24,2	3	17,6		
Partizip II		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	44,198	,000
	Pre-class	1	25,0	0	0,0	7	15,9	6	12,5	17	48,6		

Fatma Karaman  
NEEDS ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF GRAMMAR STRUCTURES NEEDED  
BY GERMAN TEACHER CANDIDATES IN LANGUAGE USE PROCESS

	1st grade	1	25,0	8	38,1	7	15,9	3	6,3	5	14,3		
	2nd grade	0	0,0	3	14,3	7	15,9	13	27,1	4	11,4		
	3rd grade	2	50,0	8	38,1	10	22,7	16	33,3	4	11,4		
	4th grade	0	0,0	2	9,5	13	29,5	10	20,8	5	14,3		
Apposition		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	42,454	,000
	Pre-class			0	0,0	4	15,4	4	6,6	23	37,7		
	1st grade			1	25,0	10	38,5	5	8,2	8	13,1		
	2nd grade			0	0,0	4	15,4	16	26,2	7	11,5		
	3rd grade			2	50,0	4	15,4	25	41,0	9	14,8		
	4th grade			1	25,0	4	15,4	11	18,0	14	23,0		

In Table 2, Chi-square test was applied to determine whether the grammatical structure requirement was dependent on the grade level variable. This test was conducted separately for all subjects. As shown in Table 2, the dependence between the need of Akkusativ, Genitiv, Imperativ, Präpositionen mit Genitiv, das Präteritum, das Perfekt, das Perfekt der Modalverben, das Futur I, das Futur II, Nebensatz dass, zu – infinitiv, konditionale, temporale, konzessive, konsekutive, modale Sätze, Finalsätze, Interrogativsätze, Relativsätze, Vorgangspassiv, Zustandspassiv, das Passiv bei Modalverben, Partizipien, Nominalisierung, Verbalisierung, Konjunktiv I, Konjunktiv II der Gegenwart, Konjunktiv II der Vergangenheit, irrealer Konditionalsätze, Wunschsätze, Adjektivdeklinaton, Deklinaton der Adjektive als Attribute, Ergänzungen, Partizip II, Apposition subjects and the class variable was found to be statistically significant as a result of the Chi Square test. However, the dependence between rtikel, Dativ, trennbare Verben, untrennbare Verben, Präpositionen mit Akkusativ, Präpositionen mit Dativ, Modalverben, das Präsens, Plusquamperfekt, Konjunktionen, kausale Nebensätze, Partizip I subjects and class variables was not statistically significant. The numerical values related are given in Table 2.

### 3.3. Grammatical Structure Needs Analysis Evaluation of Structured Interview Form Data

A structured interview form consisting of seven items was applied to 47 prospective teachers. In order to determine whether the participants have experience abroad, the first article includes the expression "I was born and raised abroad." All participants selected no for this statement. Therefore, none of the prospective teachers who participated in the research had overseas experience. To the article with the question which book or resource do you use in grammar lessons? the students of the preparatory class stated that they benefit from the books Übungsgrammatik für die Grundstufe, Regeln, Listen, Übungen written by Muechen, Clamer and Heilmann and published by Hueber and Liebaug and

from internet sources; 1st grade students stated that they benefit from *Übungsgrammatik für die Grundstufe, Regeln, Listen, Übungen*, Dreyer and Lehr- und Übungsbuch der deutschen Grammatik written by and Schmitt and published by Hueber, Modern German book written by Zengin in Turkish in Turkey, photocopies, internet and YouTube videos; 2nd grade students stated that they benefit from Lehr- und Übungsbuch der deutschen Grammatik, *Übungsgrammatik für die Grundstufe, Regeln, Listen, Übungen*, internet sources, photocopies and presentations; 3rd grade students stated that they benefit from Lagun written by the commission, Lehr- und Übungsbuch der deutschen Grammatik, *Übungsgrammatik für die Grundstufe, Regeln, Listen, Übungen*, websites; 4th grade students stated that they benefit from *Übungsgrammatik für die Grundstufe, Regeln, Listen, Übungen*, Lehr- und Übungsbuch der deutschen Grammatik, German grammar and exam guide written by Erdem Karabulut, Modern German and websites in German.

From the 1st grade, those who replied “no” to article 3 of the semi-structured interview form with the question Does the book or resource you use meet your grammatical structure for the effective use of the language?, stated that women the German level of the book was too high for them, that the topics were handled in more detail than necessary, that there were many unused rules in the book, that there were no practical exercises and that the language level was higher than they could understand; those who replied “yes” stated that it was a book on a wide range of topics and that the topics were explained in detail. Those who said no from the 2nd grade stated that the examples given were more complicated than the level of the students, that they drowned in the details in the book, had difficulty understanding because it was written in German, and because there were no visuals in the photocopy; those who said yes, because they considered the book as a source sufficient for foreign language teaching if every subject was included in it. Those who said no from the 3rd grade cited too many conceptual explanations in the book (*Übungsgrammatik für die Grundstufe, Regeln, Listen, Übungen*), heavy language, and texts far from everyday life as their reasons; those who said yes, stated that the book's detailed description of the topics and the adequate use of space-filling exercises met the needs of the grammatical structure for using the language effectively. Those who said no from the 4th grade evaluated the fact that there were too many terms in the books, no speech patterns and practical exercises, and the presence of structures away from the daily language as a negative situation; those who said yes indicated the fact that all grammar rules are covered in the books, that they were composed of high-level texts, that there were many examples for practice, that the books explain all subjects in German showed that the resources they used were meeting their grammatical needs. Students from the preparatory class stated that they generally found the resources they used sufficient. According to them, in their book (*Menschen*), the grammar rules are clearly defined, activities on speaking and listening are useful, and the book contains detailed descriptions, audio and video recordings (CDs), so it is an easily comprehensible and comprehensive resource.

In general, the common reasons for the negative opinions about the resource used by all five classes are; sources include many terminological explanations, lack of hands-on exercises, grammatical structures being explained in heavy German, content away from daily language use. The reasons for those who gave positive opinions about the sources are that the subjects are explained in detail in the sources they use, all subjects are included in the sources and that there are many examples. Those who said yes to Article 3 generally evaluate the fact that all the grammar issues are included in the books in detail positively; while those who said no evaluated this situation as negative.

In article 4, it was asked in which areas they needed to use grammatical structures. It was seen that preparatory class students used them in writing, reading and listening skills in that order; 2nd graders in writing and speaking; 3rd graders in writing and speaking and 4th graders in writing, speaking, listening and reading skills. An interesting point obtained from the data is that grammar structures are not used in all skills. When the data were examined, it was discovered that preparatory class students don't use grammatical structures for speaking skills; 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade students don't use them for reading and listening skills, whereas 4 classes use grammatical structures for all four skills. This can be viewed in two different ways. First, because the concept teaching is done in grammar lessons, the structures learned remain passive in the students' minds and cannot be transferred to the four basic language skills that allow the use of language. The second is that students do not know how to use language due to lack of language awareness (*Sprachbewusstsein*).

In article 5, participants were asked whether they needed the real-life language use of the subjects they saw in the grammar course and asked them to write the reasons for their answers. All of the preparatory students answered yes to this question and stated as their reasons that sentences could not be formed without grammar, that grammar was necessary for effective and correct use of the language, that they had to express themselves in different modes of time, that they included daily speech structures and that it was important to use the language correctly.

1st grade students who said no, stated that there were unnecessary details, that there was not much opportunity for practice, that there was no need for grammar in conversation, and that simple structures were used in daily speaking language, said that they don't even speak according to the grammar in their mother tongues, that those who spoke the language didn't drown it in grammar; those who said yes, stated that they had to use grammar when practicing, they preferred to speak by following the rules while they were talking, and that they tried to tell many things in German by now.

Those who said no from the second grade justified their thoughts by saying that people did not pay attention to the rules of grammar in the spoken language and that the subjects they saw in the language and grammar were completely different; those who said yes, stated that you had to also make sentences while talking, that grammar was necessary for understanding what is meant to be understood, grammar was very important to be able to use the language when talking to people in daily life. Those who said no from the 3rd grade stated that grammar is not very important in daily life, they

do not form advanced sentences, they do not make sentences that require intensive grammar in daily life; those who said yes stated that grammar is a must for establishing a regular sentence and that grammar is one of the building blocks of language. Those who said no from the 4th grade said that they learn grammar subjects in too much detail, that they do not need to use grammar rules in detail, that they prefer simple and understandable patterns in daily life, that some grammar rules such as Futur II are outdated and no longer used speech, that there was no need for so many details to be included in grammar classes, that they are taught so many rules which they didn't use, and that even the Germans do not use such rules in daily life and that they do not use most subject except the basic structures; and although the number of those who answered yes was small, they stated that they used grammar as it was important in establishing sentences.

To the question of whether there are any grammar issues that they considered unnecessary to be taught in Article 6, the prep students answered no and stated that they consider all the grammar subjects taught as necessary. This can be explained with the fact that they think they need to learn all the grammar subjects without making any distinctions, and that they have just started to learn the language, they have no experience of using foreign language compared to other grade levels and they have not yet began the process of using the language. 1st grade students stated that they thought it unnecessary to teach "Perfekt der Modalverben, Futur II, Konjunktiv I, Interrogativsätze, Ergänzungen, Plusquamperfekt, Apposition, Partizipien, Zustandpassiv" structures; 2nd grade students stated that they thought it unnecessary to teach "temporale Adverbien, Futur II, Partizipien, Präposition mit Verben, Konjunktiv I, Perfekt der Modalverben"; 3rd grade students stated that they thought it unnecessary to teach "Plusquamperfekt, Präteritum, Konjunktiv I, Partizip, Futur II"; 4th grade students stated that they thought it unnecessary to teach "Konjunktiv I, Partizip, Das Futur II, Präpositionen mit Genitiv und Dativ, Plusquamperfekt, Präteritum, Gegenwart der Konjunktiv II, Apposition." The results of these data coincide with the results obtained from the questionnaire form.

In the last article, the participants were asked if they had a private German grammar teacher, how would they want them to teach to with the aim to determine the deficiencies in the course process and to find out what the participants wanted their grammar teachers to be like. Preparatory students stated that their ideal grammar teacher would give a lecture focused on speaking and reading, focus on short and concise narration, focus more on writing and listening, give grammatical structures in a way that would help them to communicate, give practical lectures and translation assignments and speak German continuously. First grade students stated that their ideal grammar teacher would teach the structures they need the most in speech and daily life, do the 20% of the lecture speaking with the 80% doing practice with them, teach with examples instead of being tied to the rules and lecturing all the time, be more superficial in lecturing and teach the rules that would help them in their writing skills, teach the reason everything is used for and not just go through the book, teach the most commonly used, experienced grammatical subjects needed in real life, then move towards more specific

subjects, not teach the rules, but help them use the rules, use visual materials and simple exercises in four basic skills and teach in the simplest most fun way, and teach the basic grammatical concepts to provide them with the four basic skills. Second grade students stated that their ideal grammar teacher would give the rules of grammar which would be used frequently in daily speaking language, teach the subjects according to what is needed the most, and make the course more practical. Third grade students stated that their ideal grammar teacher would teach grammar only by explaining the structures that will be used in daily life, give priority to frequently used structures that students should learn firstly in daily life instead of giving them later, teach them by comparing mother tongue and target foreign language subjects, give basic subjects in a simple and understandable way to help them talk more and establish dialogue, and explain grammatical subjects by associating them with daily life. Fourth grade students stated that their ideal grammar teacher would teach grammar structures in a more fun and memorable way, make lots of activities for speaking and listening, teach the subjects not in a straight order from the book but give the easier ones first and then explain the complex subjects step by step later, explain the grammar of daily language, explain the uses of daily language and explain the reasons for grammar.

#### **4. Discussion and Conclusion**

In this study, the grammatical structures that German teacher candidates need in German grammar courses in their communication environments and daily language use were determined and the grammatical structures that the students did not use were determined according to the results and the subjects that were not required to be taught in the grammar course were determined in line with the opinions of the students. In this study, the grammatical structures needed by the prospective German teachers to use the language effectively were searched and the grammar topics were listed according to their opinions and importance and priorities. It has been examined whether these needs differ according to the class level and the variables of birth and growth abroad. In addition, it was determined which skills they need to use grammatical structures the most. In order to support the data obtained from the Grammatical Structure Usage Frequency Questionnaire Form, it was investigated whether the linguistic structure needs of the participants were met through the subjects they saw in the grammar class, whether they needed the subjects taught in class in real life language usage situations, whether there were any subjects they found unnecessary to teach with the Grammar Structure Needs Analysis Structured Interview Form. In this context, the data obtained from 152 prospective teachers who participated in the research showed to what extent the students needed grammatical structures in both grammar books and textbooks for oral and written language, how often they used the said structures, whether there was a statistically significant relationship between the required level of grammatical structures and grade variable. In addition, what resources students used in grammar teaching, whether the linguistic structure needs were met with the resources they use in the course,

what skills they needed to use grammatical structures the most in grammar class, whether they needed the grammar subjects they learn in class in real life situations and how they would want a private German teacher to teach like, was found out with semi-structured interviews.

In each context, frequency and percentage values of the frequency of use of grammatical structures of the participants were given. Accordingly, the structures used at high, medium and low levels were grouped. Frequently used structures according to data are "Artikel, Akkusativ, Dativ, Genitiv, Modalverben, Präsens, Präteritum, Perfekt, Nebensatz dass, zu-infinitiv, Relativsätze, Wunschsätze, Adjektivdeklination"; moderately used structures are "trennbare Verben, untrennbare Verben, Plusquamperfekt, Futur I, Konjunktionen, kausale, konditionale, temporale Nebensätze, Vorgangspassiv, Nominalisierung, Verbalisierung, Konjunktiv II der Gegenwart, Konjunktiv II der Vergangenheit, irreal Konditionalsätze, Deklination der Adjektive als Attribute, Partizip I"; and the structures almost never used are "Imperativ, Präpositionen mit Akkusativ, mit Dativ, mit Genitiv, das Perfekt der Modalverben, das Futur II, konzessive, konsekutive, modale Nebensätze, Finalsätze, Interrogativsätze, Zustandspassiv, das Passiv bei Modalverben, Partizipien, Konjunktiv I, Partizip II ve Apposition." As can be seen, it can be said that the structures that are not needed by the students are taught in the course. Therefore, teaching of structures with low or almost no use frequency and rate, such as Futur II, Konjunktiv I, Apposition, can create a negative situation in terms of time, work load and decrease students' interest, motivation and energy in foreign language teaching for both learner and instructor. Another important aspect of the research results is that students are exposed to learning structures that they do not need in real life. While Präsens, Präteritum, Perfekt are sufficient for students to express themselves, Futur I is a structure rarely used by students. Plusquamperfekt and Futur II were found to be structures almost never used by the students. This can be interpreted as the ability of students to express the situations and actions they wish to express with Futur I using Präsens. This is because Präsens can be used both in the present tense and the tense and sometimes in the future tense function. Therefore, although the structures of Plusquamperfekt, Futur I and Futur II are taught in grammar classes every semester, students do not need to learn these structures permanently because they do not use these times in daily life. Das Perfekt der Modalverben structure is also among the structures that are almost never used by the students. Because Präteritum is preferred in modal verbs instead of this structure and for the students this structure can be established syntactically more easily than das Perfekt der Modalverben structure. For example, "Mein Bruder hat gut Fußball spielen können" is more difficult to learn syntactically relative to the students' perspective than "Mein Bruder konnte gut spielen." When the first sentence is made as a sub-sentence, the sentence becomes more complex in order: "Mein Vater hat gesagt, dass mein Bruder gut Fußball hat spielen können." Because of the different uses of language in daily conversations (Karaman, 2014: 58), these structures are also a means of communication depending on the preference of the user. Ozer and Korkmaz concluded in a study of theirs that a simple language education should be

brought to the students with the understanding that they can use the foreign language only to talk to foreigners in daily life and to continue their daily lives if they are abroad. (2016: 82) In the model designed by Karaman for a short-term foreign language teaching, it is necessary to make grammatical explanations to the extent required by the communication situations in foreign language teaching, instead of giving the grammar rules in detail as in the grammar books, the linguistic structures necessary for communication are transferred and explanations should be made depending on the example use as needed by the students (2018).

According to the chi-square test conducted to determine whether the grammatical structure requirement is related to the class level variable, the dependence between the need of Akkusativ, Genitiv, Imperativ, Präpositionen mit Genitiv, das Präteritum, das Perfekt, das Perfekt der Modalverben, das Futur I, das Futur II, Nebensatz dass, zu – infinitiv, konditionale, temporale, konzessive, konsekutive, modale Sätze, Finalsätze, Interrogativsätze, Relativsätze, Vorgangspassiv, Zustandspassiv, das Passiv bei Modalverben, Partizipien, Nominalisierung, Verbalisierung, Konjunktiv I, Konjunktiv II der Gegenwart, Konjunktiv II der Vergangenheit, Irreale Konditionalsätze, Wunschsätze, Adjektivdeklination, Deklination der Adjektive als Attribute, Ergänzungen, Partizip II, Apposition subjects and the class variable was found to be statistically significant; the dependence between rtikel, Dativ, trennbare Verben, untrennbare Verben, Präpositionen mit Akkusativ, Präpositionen mit Dativ, Modalverben, das Präsens, Plusquamperfekt, Konjunktionen, kausale Nebensätze, Partizip I subjects and class variables was not statistically significant.

According to the data obtained from the structured interview form, which consists of seven items and applied to 47 prospective teachers, no participant has any experience abroad. Participants use “Menschen, Übungsgrammatik für die Grundstufe, Regeln, Listen, Übungen, Lehr- und Übungsbuch der deutschen Grammatik,” modern German and websites as sources.

According to the participants, in general the the sources used in the grammar course are handled in more detail than necessary, there is a large number of structures not used in daily life, the resources used in the course are higher than the students' German levels and the language is heavy, the examples of practical applications are included in the books, students have difficulty in understanding because of the high level, even the practice examples are complex according to the level of the students, the book contains a lot of details, there is a lack of visuals in the photocopies, there are too many conceptual explanations, so that resources used don't meet the needs for grammatical structures to use the language effectively. The reasons of those who gave positive opinions about the sources are that the subjects in the sources they use are explained in detail, all subjects are included in the sources and there are many examples. Those who said yes to Article 3 generally evaluate the fact that all the grammar issues are included in the books in detail in a positive light, and those who gave no as an answer evaluated this situation as negative. When the data were examined, it is seen that the prep students don't use grammatical structures for speech skills; 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade

students don't use grammatical structures in their reading and listening skills, whereas 4 classes use grammatical structures in all four skills.

All of the prep students stated that they needed the subjects they saw in the grammar course in their daily life. Other participants who gave negative opinions about this issue stated that they used simpler structures in everyday language than they learned in the course, they saw a lot of unnecessary details in the course, and they did not form sentences with complex rules in daily life; those who expressed a positive opinion stated that they cannot speak without grammar rules and that these rules are very important for establishing sentences.

Again, all preparatory class students deemed it necessary to teach all grammar subjects. 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade students stated that they found it unnecessary to teach Futur II, Plusquamperfekt, Konjunktiv I, Perfekt der Modalverben, Apposition, Ergänzungen, Zustandpassiv, Präpositionen mit Genitiv und mit Dativ, Partizip, Gegenwart der Konjunktiv II, Präteritum, Interrogativsätze, Präpositionen mit Verben structures.

Students' expectations from grammar teachers were determined from the data obtained from the interviews. According to this, students expect their teachers to teach the structures they will need the most in speaking and daily life, teach them in the simplest and most fun manner using visual materials and simple exercises, teach the four basic skills with basic grammatical concepts, teach according to what is most needed and frequency of usage, focus more on practice in class, give priority to the frequently used structures rather than giving the grammatical structures that the student should learn first for use in the daily life later in the class, and teach by comparing the mother tongue and the target foreign language.

## 5. Recommendations

As a result of this research, the following suggestions can be made regarding the grammar teaching process.

- 1) The books used for teaching German grammar should not have an intense content of terms, not too many mechanical exercise types, subjects should not be explained in more detail than necessary, and practice types should be used.
- 2) Subjects should be taught without prioritizing the grammatical progression in textbooks, that is, giving priority to the grammatical structures that students often use, rather than sorting out subjects as usual and structures such as Futur II, Perfekt der Modalverben, Apposition, which is relatively less used and almost never used should be taught later or removed from the program. Instead of teaching all grammar subjects, priority should be given to transferring frequently used structures from the results of the research above.
- 3) Grammar books explaining the linguistic features of German in detail and the grammar books to be used for foreign language teaching should be supported and contextually arranged with practical exercises in order to include the structures

- that will enable the use of language. Because it is not necessary to teach all the linguistic features of the language in order to communicate in a foreign language.
- 4) For learners of German as a foreign language, instead of a grammar book that includes all grammar subjects, a local grammar book should be prepared, which allows the use of language in communication environments and contains frequently used structures in communication environments.
  - 5) In grammar books, priorities should be given to the subjects needed in order to develop communicative skills instead of the subjects not used in daily life. In books, explanations should be given regarding how to use grammatical structure rather than conceptual explanations.

### About the Author

Dr. Fatma Karaman has a PhD in German Language Teaching. She is a faculty member at Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Department of German Language Teaching.

### References

- Acat, M. B., Demiral, S. (2002). Sources of Motivation in Learning Foreign Language in Turkey. *Educational Administration in Theory & Practice*, 31, 312-329. Retrieved from: <http://www.kuey.net/index.php/kuey/article/view/507>
- Aktaş, T. (2005). Communicative Ability in the Foreign Language Teaching. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, (1)1, 89-100. Retrieved from: <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/9/10>.
- Aytaş, G., Çeçen, M. A. (2010). The Place and Importance of Grammar Teaching in Mother Tongue Education. *TÜBAR-XXVII*, 77-89. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/156982>.
- Bağcı Ayrancı, B. (2017). Investigation of Turkish Teachers' Opinions on Grammar Teaching with Sense Method. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 5(1), 145-164. Retrieved from: <https://doaj.org/article/87564f7a89814e35b224fc50844aaa6d>.
- Balcı, T.(1997). The Germanistik-respectively. German as a foreign language study in Turkey. *information German as a foreign language*, 5/24, 621-624. Redrieved from: <http://aves.cu.edu.tr/YayinGoster.aspx?ID=1331&NO=36>.
- Balcı, U. (2016). Students' language learning problems for tourism and the proposed solutions. *Jasss*, 50, 93-100.
- Bayraktaroğlu, S. (2015). *Foreign Language Education in Turkey*. Ankara: Öğretmen dünyası Publisher.
- Bölükbaş, F. (2016). The Language Needs Analysis of Syrian Refugees: İstanbul sample. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 9(46), 21-31. Retrieved from: [http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt9/sayi46\\_pdf/1dil\\_edebiyat/bolukbas\\_fatma.pdf](http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt9/sayi46_pdf/1dil_edebiyat/bolukbas_fatma.pdf).

- Bredel, U. (2013). *Language examination and grammar lessons, 2nd edition*. Schöningh: UTB Publisher.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The Elements of Language Curriculum*. USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Bulut, M. (2014). Effects of Contradictions in Terms in Teaching Grammar on Teaching Turkish. *Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9(12), 43-55, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.7339>.
- Can, E., Işık Can, C. (2014). Problems Encountered In Second Foreign Language Teaching In Turkey. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 4(2), 43-63. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/trkefd/issue/21480/230204>
- Çalışkan, N., Çangal, Ö. (2015). Needs Analysis in Teaching Turkish to Foreigners: The Case of Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education* 13(2), 310-334. Retrieved from: <http://efdergi.ibu.edu.tr/index.php/efdergi/article/view/1257/2168>.
- Çelebi, M. D. (2006). Education of Mother Tongue and Teaching Foreign Language in Turkey. *Journal of Erciyes University Institute of Social Sciences*, 2 (21), 285-307. Retrieved from: <http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423879786.pdf>.
- Demirel, Ö. (2015). *Curriculum Development in Education*. 22. Press, Ankara: Pegem Publisher.
- Duden. (2010). *Grammar for what? The benefits of grammar knowledge in everyday life and at school*. Mannheim: Duden Publisher.
- Göçer, A. (2015). The Place, Functions and Teaching of Grammar Learning Area in the Development of Basic Language Skills: A Thematic Approach in the Integrity Principle and Induction Method Axis. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 4(1), 233-242. Retrieved from: <http://www.jret.org/FileUpload/ks281142/File/22.gocer.pdf>.
- Güneş, F. (2013). New Approaches in Teaching Grammar. *Journal of Language and Literature Education*. 2(7), 71-92. Retrieved from: [https://acikders.ankara.edu.tr/pluginfile.php/75602/mod\\_resource/content/0/dilbilgisi%20%C3%B6%C4%9Fretimi.pdf](https://acikders.ankara.edu.tr/pluginfile.php/75602/mod_resource/content/0/dilbilgisi%20%C3%B6%C4%9Fretimi.pdf).
- Güven, A. Z. (2013). Problems of Teaching Linguistics Subjects. *Journal of Language and Literature Education*, 2(6), 1-10. Retrieved from: <https://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423875300.pdf>.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing Language Courses: A Guide for Teachers*. Canada: Heinle Publishers.
- Harley, B. (1993). Instructional strategies and SLA in early French immersion. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 245-259, doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100011980.
- Haznedar, B. (2004). Teaching Foreign Languages in Turkey: Elementary Foreign Language Program. *Boğaziçi University Education Journal*, 21(2), 15-29. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/buje/issue/3821/51404>
- Hoffman, L. (2013). *German grammar*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Publisher.

- Ingendahl, W. (1999). *Speech reflection instead of grammar. A didactic concept for all school levels*. Tübingen: Niemeyer Publisher.
- IWAI, Tomoko; et al. (1999). Japanese Language Needs Analysis, University of Hawaii at Manoa: *Second Language Teaching & Curriculum*. Center. Retrieved from: <http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/networks/NW13/NW13.pdf>.
- İşcan, A., Kolukısa, H. (2005). Status of Secondary Grammar Teaching, Problems and Solutions. *Atatürk University Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences*. 5 (1), 299-308. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ataunisobil/issue/2815/37886>.
- Jantzen, C., Merklinger D. (2012). *Reading and writing, learning perspectives and experience*: Fillibach Publisher.
- Karasar, N. (2000). *Scientific Research Methods*. Ankara: Nobel Publisher.
- Karaman, F. (2018). A Practical Language Teaching Model for Short Term Language Teaching, 2nd International Education Research and Teacher Education Congress, (Ed. Bostancı, A. B. & Koçak, S.) p. 121-126, ISBN: 978-605-67840-2-6.
- Karaman, F. (2016). A Sample Application for The Transfer of Grammar to Four Skills in German As a Foreign Language. *Diyalog* 2016/2: 92-103. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/276631>.
- Karaman, F. (2014). The Pragmatic Perspective of Heuristic Words. *Journal of Language and Literature Education*, 12, 57-65. Retrieved from: <https://arastirmax.com/tr/system/files/dergiler/25770/makaleler/12/1/arastirmax-sozde-bos-sozlerin-edim-dilbilimsel-yani.pdf>.
- Kalfa, M. (2015). Subject Field Competency Analysis of Teachers of Turkish as a Foreign Language. *Education and Science*, 40 (181), 241-253, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2015.3064>.
- Kırmızı, B. (2013). Impact of Teaching Grammar through Text on 11th Grade Students' Grammar Achievement in German Lessons. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 8(8), 805-821. Retrieved from: <https://arastirmax.com/en/system/files/dergiler/79199/makaleler/8/8/arastirmax-almanca-derslerinde-metne-dayali-dil-bilgisi-ogretiminin-birinci-sinif-ogrencilerinin-dil-bilgisi-basarisina-etkisi.pdf>.
- Koçer, Ö. (2013). The First Step in Curriculum Development: Needs and Situation Analysis in Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language. *Education and Science*, 38 (169), 159-174. Retrieved from: <http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/view/1917>
- Köller, W. (1997). *Functional grammar lessons*. Hohengehren: Schneider Publisher.
- Ördek, E., Bolat, H. (2016). The Sufficiency of Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Teaching Vocational German for Tourism. *Diyalog* 2, 104-115. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/diyalog/issue/27718/292437>.
- Özer, B., Korkmaz, C. (2016). Factors Affecting Student Achievement in Foreign Language Teaching. *Ekev Academy Journal*, 20(67), 59-84. Retrieved from: [http://www.ekevakademi.org/Makaleler/2088628658\\_03%20Bayram%20OZER-Celalettin%20KORKMAZ.pdf](http://www.ekevakademi.org/Makaleler/2088628658_03%20Bayram%20OZER-Celalettin%20KORKMAZ.pdf).

- Peçenek, D. (2014). Perspectives of the Undergraduates Majoring in Linguistics on Grammar learning and teaching in Foreign Language Teaching. *Başkent University Journal of Education*, 1(1), 93-111. Retrieved from: <http://buje.baskent.edu.tr/index.php/buje/article/view/14>.
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. 4th printing, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Malaysia: Longman Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suna, Y., Durmuşçelebi, M. (2013). A Compilation Work about Why Turkey Suffers from Learning and Teaching English. *OPUS Journal*, 3(5), 31-48. Retrieved from: <https://www.opusjournal.net/opusarsiv/2013-2/2013-2-1.pdf>.
- Steinig, W. & Huneke, H. W. (2010). *German as a foreign language, an introduction* 34. 5B. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Publisher.
- Storch, G. (2009). *German as a foreign language, a didactic*. Stuttgart: Wilhelm Fink Publisher.
- MEB (2013). *Telc Language Tests, Common European Framework of Recommendations for Languages Learning, Teaching and Evaluation* Publisher: telc GmbH, Frankfurt/Main, Germany.
- Ural, A., Kılıç, İ. (2006). *Scientific Research Process and Data Analysis with SPSS*. Ankara: Detay publishing.
- Yalçın, Ş. (2013). Content Based Foreign Language Teaching Model. *Boğaziçi University Journal of Education*, 30(2), 107-121. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/324185>.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).