

Grammatical Transfer Between Languages and its Effect on Translation Competence Revisited: The Case of French Grammatical Categories of Auxiliaires and Présent Parfait

Mitra Alizadeh^{1*}

* Correspondence:

alizadehmitra4@gmail.com

¹ Department of English Language
Translation, Lahijan Branch, Islamic
Azad University, Lahijan, Iran

Received: 8 January 2023

Revision: 2 March 2023

Accepted: 19 June 2023

Published online: 20 December 2023

Abstract

One of the main difficulties facing English as a Foreign Language learners in general and translation students in particular is their lack of mastery of the complexities of grammar in the target language they are learning. This study was an attempt to investigate the influence of categories of auxiliaries (auxiliaires) and present perfect (présent parfait) on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' ability to use them in English. A total of 60 Iranian male and female sophomore EFL language learners participated in the study. They were chosen out of 90 participants through a piloted version of the Nelson-Danny Test as the homogeneity test. The selected participants were divided into two groups: an experimental group and a control group, with 30 students in each class. In the present study, the participants were subjected to a pretest, treatment, and posttest. Independent samples t-tests were used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that knowledge of French grammar, especially the présent parfait, significantly affected Iranian EFL learners' grammatical knowledge of the same notions in English. The findings could be employed by English teachers, EFL learners, and materials developers in the field of ELT in the Iranian context.

Keywords: [French auxiliaries \(Auxiliaires\)](#), [French present perfect \(Présent parfait\)](#), [translation trainees](#), [translation competence](#)

1. Introduction

It is difficult to define the learning of a foreign language as far as grammar is concerned (Teodor & Munteanu, 2013). Grammar was associated with a time of disapproval and a specific crisis during the 1960s and 1970s. However, at the present time, it has gained a significant role in foreign language teaching. This recursion indicates that learning grammar is essential for anyone wishing to learn English or French (Strawson, 2017). According to Soodmand-Afshar and Bagherieh (2014), it is generally believed that mastering English vocabulary and grammar are the major steps on the way to learning the language. As indicated by Richards and Schmidt (2002, p. 109), consciousness raising (CR) is a “technique that encourages learners to pay attention to language form in the belief that an awareness of form will contribute indirectly to language acquisition.” As indicated by Phoocharoensil (2012), learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) are usually exhausted by learning grammar in its traditional style, i.e., in a classroom context where educators basically concentrate their teaching on introducing grammar rules through long and boring lectures. Cheng (2012) recommends that EFL students learn grammatical structures through self-discovery. In addition, computer-based activities can present certain linguistic examples that are inaccessible in traditional language structure course books.

As Arachchi (2014) states, the French and English languages have various linguistic relations, regardless of their different origins. French is a subdivision of the Indo-European family and has the qualities of the Romance languages, and English is derived from a Germanic origin that originated in the 5th century because of the invasion of England by Germanic tribes. It is therefore remarkable to see the connection between these two languages, which come from different homelands. Arachchi believes that major similarities can be seen between French and English in the areas of grammar and vocabulary. During the Norman attack on Britain in the 11th century, the French language became the medium of correspondence for the high classes. Consequently, many French words were merged into the English language. Another area that is very similar in French and English is the grammatical aspects (Buysse et al., 2017).

As indicated by Ebrahimpourtaher and Eissaie (2015), second language (L2) learners and instructors face many difficulties during the time spent in L2 learning. The most challenging issue in learning a second language is grammar, and no domain of language learning has been the subject of as much research as language structure. Whether or not grammar ought to be taught has been frequently debated in the fields of language pedagogy and research. A large number of L2 students feel awkward about grammar since they have been confused by it previously. This is not surprising given the quantity of rules, their complexity, and all the terminology related to them. EFL learning has always been a challenging task for Iranian adult students.

The difficulty encountered in learning English may be attributed to various factors and variables, one of which is the grammar of English. L2 students and educators are faced with a number of challenges during L2 learning, with grammar standing out as the most challenging issue. Thus, teaching grammar is one of the problematic parts of L2 learning (Ebrahimpourtaher & Eissaie, 2015). From another point of view, French and English grammar are fundamentally similar in nature. For instance, the two languages have auxiliaries, participles, active and passive voice, and past, present, and future tenses. Nevertheless, there are a number of contrasts that can be problematic for French speakers communicating in English. A common issue is the incorrect selection of tense-similarities and differences between English and French (Buysse et al., 2017). With this in mind, the present study aims to investigate the effect of knowledge of the French grammatical categories of auxiliaries (auxiliaires) and present perfect (présent parfait) on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' ability to use them in English. The following research questions were developed based on the purpose of the study and the problems stated above:

1. Does knowledge of French auxiliaries (auxiliaires) have any statistically significant effect on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' knowledge of English auxiliary verbs?
2. Does knowledge of the French present perfect (présent parfait) have any statistically significant effect on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' knowledge of the English present perfect tense?
3. Does knowledge of French grammar affect EFL learners' auxiliary and present perfect differently?

The following research hypotheses were formulated based on the research questions stated:

- **H01:** Knowledge of French auxiliaries (auxiliaires) has no statistically significant effect on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' knowledge of English auxiliary verbs.
- **H02:** Knowledge of French present perfect (présent parfait) has no statistically significant effect on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' knowledge of the English present perfect tense.
- **H03:** There is no statistically significant difference between Iranian sophomore translator trainees' knowledge of auxiliary and present perfect based on their knowledge of French grammar.

2. Review of the Literature

2.1 Preliminaries

[Bade \(2008\)](#) defines grammar as the structure of a language, a set of rules that indicate changes in words and how they connect to form new units. [Rivers \(1968\)](#) states that grammar is frequently viewed as a set of principles that are conveyed with difficult terminology and have numerous exceptions. Nevertheless, these points are challenged by an alternate perspective on sentence structure, which has been developed in recent decades. These days, grammar is not regarded as a group of morphosyntactic rules but as a means of communication, that is, to intercede with words and context ([Duso, 2007](#)). Along this new path, grammar becomes a set of guidelines that enable the speaker to comprehend a language and create accurate expressions ([Pontarolo, 2013](#)). [Duso \(2007\)](#) records the diverse levels to which the idea of sentence structure points: the phonological level, which incorporates pronunciation, rhythm, and intonation; the morphosyntactic level; the sociolinguistic level, which embraces the varieties and registers of a language; the lexical level, which comprises semantics and morphology; the pragmatic level, in other words, the communicative acts performed through language; and the textual level, which represents the components of a text and the various types of texts.

[Larsen-Freeman \(1991\)](#) clarifies the concept of grammar from another perspective, stating that there are three aspects to manage when teaching grammar. These are the types of structures, which are the means by which syntactical structures are made; the meaning of the structures, which is lexical yet linguistic as well; and the pragmatic conditions that manage the use of structures, for example, the connection between grammar and context. These are interconnected elements of the same unit, and in this manner, they are not sorted out hierarchically but rather are all at a similar level of significance.

With regard to translation in general and the translation of grammatical structures in particular, efforts have been made to conceptualize and create a practical foundation for the training of future translators ([Šeböková, 2010](#)). In this regard, the concept of translation competence (TC) plays a noticeable part. Generally, TC is seen as the fundamental knowledge or capability required to carry out a translation task. In spite of this, this concept has not been adequately investigated across languages, especially those of the same family. The present study is thus an attempt to demonstrate the similarities in the grammar between English and French. It also indicates whether mastery of grammatical structures in French can facilitate the learning of the same notions in English.

2.2 Background Studies

[Fitri \(2011\)](#) tried to provide observational information about the connection between learners' grammar proficiency and their translation ability from English into Bahasa Indonesia and the other way around at UN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. The 30 participants in this investigation were all university students selected randomly from the seventh semester's students in translation class. The alternative hypothesis that suggested a significant connection between grammar proficiency and translating skill was accepted. Fitri also came to the conclusion that the score of grammar proficiency can be used to predict whether the score of translating expertise will go up or down.

[Teodor and Munteanu \(2012\)](#) investigated the dimensions of learning the grammar of a foreign language through discovery. They stated that learning foreign language grammar through discovery can be intriguing from many perspectives. Basically, this urges learners to be dynamic since the method requires constant exploration. They are encouraged to analyze objective facts and control techniques. They can also use them in other situations that lead to self-sufficiency. To a certain extent, this kind of educational movement signals the beginning of an exploratory and logical endeavor. As a result, the spirit of precision develops, and creative doubt increases. Furthermore, the actions performed by students under the direction of the instructor must be tailored to their specific needs and abilities. Additionally, it enhances students' ability to comprehend different perspectives, which encourages them to develop reasoning skills. Learning grammar through discovery can be challenging both for the instructor and for the students; however, it makes them realize how this academic approach has a developmental impact on them. Working on a grammatical problem, the students use language as a framework and monitor the dimensions of these examination procedures. These are the grammatical operations of affixation, substitution, displacement, or abstraction. Indeed, an educator is willing to take risks. However, it might be more fascinating to follow the discovery approach than to stick to the strict path outlined in books.

[Liu \(2014\)](#) carried out a comparative study of English and French tenses. As suggested by Liu, both English and French are the sub-branches of the Indo-European family; however, English is categorized under Germanic groups and French is categorized under Romance. Regardless of the fact that the Normandy Conquest happened nine centuries ago, the impact of French on English is huge. Many French words were overflowed into English following the Normandy Conquest, having a significant impact on the language's advancement. Since the two languages are comparative in such aspects as pronunciation, lexicology, and syntax, the investigation of the connection between

them has been an area to examine in the investigation of foreign languages. Liu assumed that tense, as the foundation of grammar learning, served as a foundation for the learners to learn a language. Contrastive analysis is constantly considered a useful way to deal with learning a language. In this manner, the contrastive examination of English and French tenses has extraordinary importance in the domain of foreign language learning and teaching. A fruitful comparison between English and French tenses is of significance for English majors with French as their L2 but also for the French majors with English as their L2 or the individuals who are keen on these two languages. Language learners ought to obviously perceive the similarities and contrasts between English and French tenses to simplify their examinations in the two languages. Liu inferred that tense is an essential part of grammar learning. Just when we have a profound comprehension of English and French tenses, we will be able to better comprehend the two languages being learned.

Pinto (2014) investigated the impacts of L2 exposure on first language (L1) grammar. A comprehension test and a narrative activity performed by twelve L1 Italians with Dutch as their L2 and 19 Italian monolinguals demonstrated no confirmation of attrition in the utilization of subject pronouns in Italian. These outcomes bolster the speculation that, in accordance with the representational view, there is no obstruction between languages that have practically identical complexity at the level of interpretable elements. The absence of L1 attrition was normal, since both Italian and Dutch have a coordinated mapping between form and comprehension at the discourse pragmatics level. The information from the production task additionally gave novel knowledge of alternative preparation methodologies used in semi-spontaneous discourse that appear to exploit contextual data as opposed to basic properties. Their inquiry remained open as to whether these decisions are motivated by contemplations at the level of linguistic use and representation or rely upon processing skills.

Ebrahimpourtaher and Eissaie (2015) performed a study of Iranian EFL students' attitudes about issues in EFL learning regarding lexis, grammar, and L1 use in learning L2 abilities. The authors surveyed Iranian intermediate EFL students' perspectives about the demanding parts of L2 learning. Every one of the respondents concurred that learning grammar was a challenging part of EFL learning. Furthermore, they praised the use of L1 and code-switching as an effective strategy for promoting grammar and vocabulary learning. German, Herschensohn, and Frenck-Mestre (2015) came to the conclusion that anglophone students of L2 French demonstrate implicit sensitivity to pronoun location and morphological awareness of clitic and strong pronouns. The results showed that anglophone L2 students of French can actually master these variables, recognizing syntactic, morphological, and phonological parts of French pronouns. This supports L2 models of learning that suggest that students should be able to access L2 linguistic classifications.

3. Methodology

3.1 Design of the Study

In the present study, the researcher followed a quasi-experimental comparison group pretest/posttest design, which is the most common quasi-experimental design. This design is the same as the classic controlled experimental design, except that the subjects cannot be randomly assigned to either the experimental or the control group, and the researcher cannot control which group will get the treatment.

3.2 Participants

The participants of the study were sixty adult sophomore male and female students with the age range of 18 to 25 at the Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon branch. At first, ninety sophomore students majoring in English translation were selected, and a piloted version of the Nelson-Danny language proficiency test was administered to them. After the administration of the test, the students whose scores fell within the range of one standard deviation above and below the mean formed the main participants of the study. The researcher could select 60 participants from among the total of 90 students taking part in the study. The selected participants were divided into two groups: one experimental group and one control group, with 30 students in each group. All the participants had studied English courses in the public schooling system, which is uniform all over the country.

3.3 Instrumentation

The data for the present study was collected by means of three instruments: a Nelson-Danny language proficiency test, a researcher-made test of the present perfect, and a test of auxiliaries.

3.3.1 Nelson-Danny Test of Language Proficiency

To evaluate the general proficiency of the participants and homogenize them, a piloted version of the Nelson-Denny test was used. There were two parts to the test: vocabulary and reading comprehension. The vocabulary section had 30 multiple-choice questions, and test takers chose from four possible answers for each one. For the reading comprehension section, the test taker read five brief passages taken from high school and college textbooks and then answered 20 multiple-choice questions testing both direct comprehension skills and the ability to make inferences based on what they had read. The entire test took about 45 minutes. The test had been piloted among 30 learners with

the same characteristics as the main participants of the study to ensure its reliability. The reliability of the test then was calculated at 0.89 based on the KR-21 method, which is an acceptable reliability.

The piloted version of the Nelson-Danny language proficiency test was then administered to a group of 90 subjects. Based on the mean plus or minus one SD, 60 subjects were selected to participate in the main study. An independent sample t-test was run to compare the experimental and control groups' means on the Nelson-Danny test in order to prove that they enjoyed the same level of general language proficiency prior to the main study. Based on the results, the experimental group ($M = 37.70$, $SD = 9.22$) and the control group ($M = 36.03$, $SD = 10.22$) had almost the same means on the Nelson-Danny test.

3.3.2 Pre- and Post-test Instruments

A forty-item researcher-made multiple-choice test of grammar, including auxiliaries and the present perfect, was developed based on the level of the learners and the concepts presented in their course book. Then the test items were checked by the experts, modified, and piloted among 30 students with the same characteristics (age, gender, and level) for the purpose of calculating the reliability of the test and then modified. Based on the KR-21 method, the test's reliability was calculated to be .71, which is an acceptable level of reliability.

This test, which was comprised of 40 items, was used both as the pre- and post-test in the present study to measure and compare the participants' auxiliaries and present-perfect knowledge before and after the treatment. Items 1 to 20 measured the auxiliary verb knowledge of the learners, and items 21 to 40 checked their present-perfect knowledge. The pretest was administered at the beginning of the semester in order to ensure the homogeneity of learners regarding their auxiliary and present-perfect knowledge. This test took the learners around 35 minutes to complete. The posttest, which was the same as the pretest, was administered at the end of the semester for the purpose of measuring the learners' grammatical knowledge concerning what they had learned throughout the course.

3.4 Procedure

3.4.1 Data Collection Procedures

The first phase of this study was the pilot phase, during which 30 intermediate students with similar features to the target sample took all the assessment instruments comprising the sample Nelson-Danny test used for homogenizing and a teacher-made multiple-choice grammar test that was to be used as the pretest and the posttest. Item analysis was performed for all the items, and the malfunctioning items with unacceptable facility and discrimination indices were removed. After carrying out item analysis, the researcher came up with a reliable test: a pre- and post-test.

In the second phase of this study, the participants were selected. First, the piloted Nelson-Danny test was administered to 90 intermediate students to homogenize them regarding their general English proficiency. Out of 90 students, 60 students whose scores had fallen one standard deviation above and below the mean formed the main participants of the study. The selected participants were randomly assigned to two groups, an experimental and a control group, with 30 students in each. It's worth mentioning that due to the nature of the convenient, non-random selection of the samples, the discarded students were still attending the classes, but their scores on the pretest and posttest were not included in the study. In the third phase, the participants of the study in both groups took part in the piloted teacher-made multiple-choice pretest to assure their homogeneity regarding their grammatical knowledge.

The treatment period then began and lasted for four sessions during the university's spring semester. The whole semester included four months (16 sessions), and the learners attended the class one day a week, with each session lasting for 90 minutes in both groups. Considering the fact that the syllabus of the classes and courses had to be covered during the semester, four sessions of 30 minutes were allocated to the experiment in the experimental group, which consisted of the sophomore English translation trainees taking the French course along with their reading comprehension course. Therefore, the classes of the control and experimental groups received the same hours of instruction and practice. Also, the researcher herself taught both groups.

Students in the experimental group received French present perfect (*présent parfait*) and auxiliaries (*auxiliaires*), as well as their related exercises, from the book *Le France en direct*. Then, the researcher gave the students activities and asked questions to check their understanding. Lastly, the researcher suggested some techniques, materials, and activities students could use during lessons and also provided them with some information concerning the positive role French knowledge can have in their learning English. This way, the learners were encouraged to take part in the classroom group work in French and use French present perfect (*présent parfait*) and auxiliaries (*auxiliaires*) in their speech. Students in the control group received a teacher-centered approach to reading comprehension in English but did not receive French instruction. At the end of the treatment (four sessions), a posttest of grammar was given to the trainees to check their development in the grammatical notions of auxiliary verbs and the present perfect tense.

3.4.2 Data Analysis Procedures

The data analysis in the present study included both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation of the piloted Nelson-Danny test, which was used for homogenizing participants, and a multiple-choice grammar test made by the teacher, which resulted in discarding some of the items. For comparing the effect of the treatment, independent samples t-tests were used as inferential statistics.

4. Results

4.1 Testing the Normality Assumption

This study examined the effect of knowledge of the French grammatical categories of auxiliaries (auxiliaires) and present perfect (présent parfait) on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' ability to use them in English. The data were analyzed through independent samples t-tests, which has the assumption of the normality of the data. As displayed in Table 1, the ratios of skewness and kurtosis over their respective standard errors were within the ranges of +/- 1.96, hence the normality of the data.

Table 1. Testing normality assumptions

Group	N	Skewness		Kurtosis				
		Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error			
Experimental	NELSON	30	.401	.427	0.94	.004	.833	0.00
	Pre Auxiliary	30	.163	.427	0.38	-.879	.833	-1.06
	Pre PRESENT PERFECT	30	.483	.427	1.13	-.289	.833	-0.35
	Post Auxiliary	30	-.271	.427	-0.63	-.733	.833	-0.88
	Post PRESENT PERFECT	30	-.211	.427	-0.49	-.988	.833	-1.19
Control	NELSON	30	-.489	.427	-1.15	-.758	.833	-0.91
	Pre Auxiliary	30	-.111	.427	-0.26	-.285	.833	-0.34
	Pre PRESENT PERFECT	30	-.513	.427	-1.20	.015	.833	0.02
	Post Auxiliary	30	-.160	.427	-0.37	-.585	.833	-0.70
	Post PRESENT PERFECT	30	-.381	.427	-0.89	-.385	.833	-0.46

4.2 The First Research Question

The first research question of the study asked whether knowledge of French auxiliary verbs had any significant effect on the Iranian sophomore translator trainees' knowledge of English auxiliary verbs. An independent samples t-test was used to compare the means of the experimental and control groups on the auxiliary posttest to investigate the first research question. Based on the results displayed in Table 2, the experimental group ($M = 24$, $SD = 3.77$) had a higher mean on the posttest of auxiliary than the control group ($M = 15.97$, $SD = 3.22$).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics; Posttest of auxiliary by groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post Auxiliary	Experimental	30	24.00	3.778	.690
	Control	30	15.97	3.222	.588

The results of the independent samples t-test ($t(58) = 8.86$, $p = .000$, $r = .758$, representing a large effect size) (Table 3) indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups' mean scores on the posttest of auxiliary.

Table 3. Independent Samples T-test, Posttest of auxiliary by groups

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means								
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.714	.402	8.862	58	.000	8.033	.907	6.219	9.848
Equal variances not assumed			8.862	56.586	.000	8.033	.907	6.218	9.849

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene's $F = .714$, $p = .402$). That is why the first row of Table 3, i.e., "Equal variances assumed," was reported. To depict the experimental and control groups' auxiliary knowledge levels after the treatment, the following figure (Figure 1) was presented: As the figure shows, the mean of the experimental group was ($M = 24.00$) and the mean of the control group was ($M = 15.97$). As the figure information shows, the difference between the two mean scores is large. The result of the t-test also showed that the two groups significantly differed in their mean score differences after the treatment.




Figure 1. Posttest of auxiliary by groups

4.3 The Second Research Question

The second research question of the study aimed at investigating whether knowledge of French present perfect (*présent parfait*) had any significant effect on Iranian sophomore translator trainees' knowledge of English present perfect. To investigate the second research question, an independent samples t-test was used to compare the means of the experimental and control groups on the present perfect posttest. Based on the results displayed in Table 4, the

experimental group ($M = 17.63$, $SD = 1.82$) had a higher mean on the posttest of present perfect than the control group ($M = 13$, $SD = 2.22$).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics; Posttest of present perfect by groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post PRESENT PERFECT	Experimental	30	17.63	1.829	.334
	Control	30	13.00	2.228	.407

The independent samples t-test results ($t(58) = 8.80$, $p = .000$, and $r = .756$ representing a large effect size) (Table 5) indicated that there was a significant difference in the mean scores of the two groups on the present perfect posttest.

Table 5. Independent Samples Test; Posttest of present perfect by groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.892	.349	8.804	58	.000	4.633	.526	3.580	5.687
Equal variances not assumed			8.804	55.871	.000	4.633	.526	3.579	5.688

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene's $F = .892$, $p = .349$). That is why the first row of Table 5, i.e., "Equal variances assumed," was reported. To depict the experimental and control groups' grammar development after the treatment, the following figure (Figure 2) is presented. As the figure shows, the mean of the experimental group was $M = 17.63$ and the mean of the control group was $M = 13.00$. The result of the t-test also showed that the two groups significantly differed in their mean score differences after the treatment.




Figure 2. Posttest of present perfect by groups

4.4 The Third Research Question

The third research question of the study aimed to investigate whether there was any significant difference between the effect of knowledge of French grammar on EFL learners' auxiliary and present perfect. A paired-samples t-test was run to compare the experimental group's means on the posttests of present perfect and auxiliary in order to probe the third research question. Based on the results displayed in Table 6, the experimental group had a higher mean on the posttest of present perfect (M = 26.45, SD = 2.74) than on the posttest of auxiliary (M = 24, SD = 3.77).

Table 6. Descriptive statistics; Posttests of auxiliary and present perfect (Experimental group)

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Posttest Present Perfect	26.45	30	2.743	.501
Posttest Auxiliary	24.00	30	3.778	.690

Note: The present perfect and auxiliary tests had 20 items (40 together). The scores were multiplied by 1.5 in order to make their comparison possible; hence, the scores reported for this section are out of 30 for both of these tests.

The results of the paired-samples t-test ($t(29) = 2.66, p = .013$, and $r = .443$, representing a moderate to large effect size) (Table 7) indicated that there was a significant difference between the experimental group's mean scores on the posttests of present perfect and auxiliary.

Table 7. Paired-Samples t-test; Posttests of present perfect and auxiliary (Experimental group)

		Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
			Lower	Upper			
2.450	5.042	.921	.567	4.333	2.662	29	.013

5. Discussion

A summary of the results section of the present study is as follows: The first null hypothesis, “Knowledge of French auxiliaries (auxiliaires) has no statistically significant effect on Iranian sophomore translator trainees’ knowledge of English auxiliary verbs,” was rejected. The second null hypothesis, “Knowledge of French present perfect (présent parfait) has no statistically significant effect on Iranian sophomore translator trainees’ knowledge of the English present perfect tense,” was also rejected. The third null hypothesis, “There is no statistically significant difference between Iranian sophomore translator trainees’ knowledge of auxiliary and present perfect based on their knowledge of French grammar,” was also rejected. The findings first revealed that EFL learners’ achievement of their target auxiliary verb was influenced by their knowledge of French grammar. Secondly, the findings showed that knowledge of French grammar significantly affected the EFL learners’ present-perfect achievement. Thirdly, the study findings also revealed that this method had affected the EFL learners’ present-perfect knowledge more than their auxiliary verb knowledge.

The findings of the present study are in line with the findings of the previous studies reported in the literature. [Klein and Vater’s \(1998\)](#) study on perfect tenses in English and German in an attempt to review the typology of verbal categories revealed that, irrespective of the mismatch between the functions of perfect tenses in German and English, learners can learn how to use them through comparison and contrast. Another significant feature proposed was that “the perfect may have idiosyncratic functions that are not predictable from its general temporal meaning” ([Klein & Vater, 1998](#), p. 215). [Legendre and Sorace \(2010\)](#) found that both French grammar instruction and French grammar knowledge have positive effects on the second language development of the learners. In their concern, the students pay more attention to the content taught. [Arachchi \(2014\)](#) also found that similarities between French and English could facilitate successful L2 development, considering both vocabulary and grammar, among ESL learners.

Apart from these general findings, the present study findings in terms of present perfect achievement are in line with the findings of [Buysse et al.’s \(2017\)](#) study, which mainly focused on the role and reference grammar account of clause linkage development in second language acquisition and found that grammar tutoring for specific notions in the ESL situation could be facilitating. In their view, teaching French grammar to ESL learners increases their English grammar achievement. [Liu \(2014\)](#) found that through French grammar instruction, the EFL learners improved their own general learning abilities as well. This study also signified that English TENSE and French TENSE enjoy specific features, some of which present their similarities, which in turn is conducive to EFL development, and others show their differences. [Pontarolo \(2013\)](#), who investigated the role of grammar in EFL instruction, came to know that familiarity with the similarities and differences between English as the target language and French as the second language or mother tongue could facilitate the learning of grammar for EFL secondary school students.

[Loaiciga, Meyer, and Popescu-Belis \(2014\)](#), who studied English-French verb phrase alignment in Europarl for tense translation modeling, presented that *Présent Parfait* in French could predict 33 and 61 percent of present perfect continuous and present perfect in English, respectively. It means that even in machine translation, French *Présent Parfait* enjoys a wider scope of functions and textual meaning. [Loaiciga et al. \(2010\)](#) asserted that the French tense predictor implemented was able to automatically learn and predict which French tense an English verb should be translated into. In general, they found that their method improved the quality of verbal translations, making both French and English translations more accurate. The present study also revealed that prior knowledge of French auxiliaries facilitates and promotes EFL auxiliary verb development. This finding is in line with [Legendre and Sorace’s \(2010\)](#) study on the account of auxiliary verbs and intransitivity in French and Romance. He found that French auxiliary verb instructions facilitate the acquisition of such verbs and their combinations in other Romance languages. A significant point in this regard was mentioned as being language similarity.

Another issue worth mentioning is the notion of variation in English. Though French auxiliaries, or the present perfect, enjoy a wider scope than that of English, the English language variations enforce different functions for auxiliary verbs, or the present perfect. One instance reported is [Engel and Ritz’s \(2000\)](#) study on the use of the present perfect in Australian English. As they found, the present perfect in Australian English is used “(1) in combination with past temporal adverbials; (2) in sequences indicating narrative progression; (3) in alternation with the simple past and the present tense to express stylistic contrast” (p. 119). All these uses seem to indicate that the category is undergoing an extension of its meaning. Another instance reported in this regard is [Richard and Rodríguez Louro’s \(2016\)](#) study on narrative-embedded variation and change in the Australian English present perfect. As they report the present perfect in Australian English, it is expanded and covers the functions that are presented by other neighboring tenses in English. The present study mainly focused on the American English use of auxiliary verbs and the present perfect tense; other studies are required to see if the knowledge of *Présent Parfait* in French can affect this tense in other English variations or not.

To summarize, the current study found that French grammar instruction had a significant impact on EFL learners' Auxiliary and Present Perfect achievement. The findings of the study also revealed that this method had a greater impact on EFL learners' present-perfect knowledge than on their second-language auxiliary verb knowledge. Theoretically speaking, French grammar instruction and learning make the students more conscious of what they are learning (Buysse et al., 2017). In this regard, learners can cope with their learning difficulties in English grammar or translation through comparing and contrasting the structures under discussion with French structures and Persian ones. Strawson (2017) implies that the instruction of French grammar can increase learning intervention in EFL/ESL situations and is conducive to good results for the learners.

6. Conclusion

The findings revealed that knowledge of the French grammatical categories of auxiliaries (auxiliaires) and present perfect (présent parfait) affected EFL learners' ability to use such notions and structures in English. The study findings also revealed that this method had affected the present-perfect knowledge of the EFL learners more than their second language auxiliary verb knowledge. The current results are consistent with recent international research in the same area (Arachchi, 2014; Buysse et al., 2017; Engel & Ritz, 2000; Klein & Vater, 1998; Legendre & Sorace, 2010; Liu, 2014; Loaiciga et al., 2014; Pontarolo, 2013; Richard & Rodríguez Louro, 2016; Strawson, 2017). Such studies show the positive effect of knowledge of French grammar on the development of EFL grammar. The present findings are also in line with the research recently conducted on the functions of the present perfect in some English variations (Engel & Ritz, 2000; Richard & Rodríguez Louro, 2016). It could be concluded that learning French grammar instruction can make EFL students more conscious of what they are learning.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank all of the students and colleagues who assisted me in preparing the first draft and revised version of the current study.

References

- Arachchi, M. K. (2014). *The similarities between French and English languages under the aspects of grammar and vocabulary*. Book of Abstracts, Annual Research Symposium 2014.
- Bade, M. (2008). Grammar and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 174-184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buysse, M., Housen, A., & Pierrard, M. (2017). A role and reference grammar account of clause linkage development in second language: An application to English and French. *Studia Linguistica*, 72(2), 472-508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/stul.12067>
- Cheng, W. (2012). *Exploring corpus linguistics: Language in action*. Oxen: Routledge.
- Duso, E. M. (2007). *Dalla teoria alla pratica: la grammatica nella classe di italiano L2*. Roma: ARACNE editrice.
- Ebrahimpourtaher, A., & Eissaie, S. (2015). A survey of Iranian EFL learners' opinions about problems in learning English as a foreign language: The case of vocabulary, grammar and L1 use in learning L2 skills. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 5(52), 986-991.
- Engel, D. M., & Ritz, M. E. A. (2000). The use of the present perfect in Australian English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 20(2), 119-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268600020006030>
- Fitri, F. (2011). *The correlation between students' grammatical ability and translating skill (a survey)*. Master's thesis, State Islamic University 'Syarif Hidayatullah' Jakarta.
- German, E. S., Herschensohn, J., & Frenck-Mestre, C. (2015). Pronoun processing in anglophone late L2 learners of French: Behavioral and ERP evidence. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 34, 15-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2014.12.001>
- Klein, W., & Vater, H. (1998). The perfect in English and German; typology of verbal categories. *Papers presented to Vladimir Nedjalkov on the occasion of his 70th birthday. Linguistische Arbeiten*, 382, 215-237.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 279-296). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Legendre, G., & Sorace, A. (2010). *Auxiliaries and intransitivity in French and in Romance: Fundamental issues in the Romance languages*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Liu, Y. (2014). A comparative study of English TENSE and French TENSE. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(11), 2314-2321. [doi:10.4304/tpls.4.11.2314-2321](https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.11.2314-2321)
- Loaiciga, S., Meyer, T., & Popescu-Belis, A. (2014). English-French verb phrase alignment in europarl for tense translation modeling. In T. Meyer (Ed.), *The ninth language resources and evaluation conference* (pp. 1-8). London: Pearson.

- Phoocharoensil, S. (2012). Language corpora for EFL teachers: An exploration of English grammar through concordance lines. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 64, 507-514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.060>
- Pinto, M. (2014). Effects of L2 exposure on L1 grammar. Retrieved from <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/galana/5/paper3069.pdf>
- Pontarolo, G. (2013). The role of grammar in EFL instruction: a study on secondary school students and teachers. Retrieved from https://thesis.unipd.it/retrieve/b07ccea0-ef7a-4c2b-88a1-24ab08a94366/Pontarolo_Giulia_2013.pdf
- Richard, S., & Rodríguez Louro, C. (2016). Narrative-embedded variation and change: The sociolinguistics of the Australian English narrative present perfect. *Re-assessing the Present Perfect*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 119-146. doi:10.1515/9783110443530-007
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching foreign-language skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Šeböková, S. (2010). *Comparing translation competence*. Master's thesis. Masaryk University.
- Soodmand-Afshar, H., & Bagherieh, M. (2014). An evaluation of grammar and vocabulary consciousness-raising activities in current ELT materials. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 109-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.298>
- Strawson, P. F. (2017). *Subject and predicate in logic and grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Teodor, Z., & Munteanu, D. V. (2013). Aspects concerning of a foreign language grammar through discovery. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 76, 901-906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.228>