

Copyright: The author/s
This work is licensed under a CC-BY 4.0 license
(*) Corresponding author
Peer review method: Double-blind
Original research article
DOI: 10.20544/HORIZONS.1.1.23.P09



THE LANGUAGE TRANSFER OF SOME GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF THE MACEDONIAN AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Stela Bosilkovska, MA*

University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Bitola, RNM
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7533-3542
E-mail: stela.bosilkovska@uklo.edu.mk

Violeta Januseva, PhD

University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Bitola, RNM
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9912-3988
E-mail: violeta.januseva@uklo.edu.mk

Abstract

This qualitative paper contrasts the Macedonian and the English language grammatical systems, i.e., their morphological and syntactic features in order to determine those which cause frequent difficulties for the Macedonian EFL learners and speakers. The sample represents formal descriptions of some features of the ML and EL grammatical systems as conventionalized in their reference grammars respectively. The juxtaposition relies upon contrastive analysis. The CA results indicate types of differences between the grammatical systems of the ML and EL which cause two-way interference, i.e., language transfer across both languages – $ML(L1) > EL(L2) > ML(L1)$. The results are valuable for modelling approaches towards enhancing Macedonian EFL communicative and translational skills.

Key words: Macedonian, English, grammatical systems, contrastive analysis, $L1 > L2 > L1$ interference

1. Introduction

The most frequent worldwide definition of contrastive analysis (CA) is that it opposes two languages and especially stresses the similarities and distinctions in the language structures that are being elaborated, considering, primarily, the effect of the native language on the acquisition of the foreign/second language (Jespersen, 1912; Fries 1945; Lado 1968; Palmer, 1978; Crystal, 1992). According to Lado (1968), as a might tool, CA identifies language domains which might engender problems for the foreign/second language learners (FL/L2).

The knowledge and understanding of the languages which come in contact and the large number of possibilities for interference are very important. Thus, the present paper contrasts the Macedonian and the English language, focusing on some of their morphological and syntactic features, in order to determine those segments that induce language transfer across both languages, and consequently either miscommunication or negative intrusion of language structures unacceptable according to the respective grammar of the other language.

2. Broader research context

Internationally, the CA of the morphological and syntactic point of view attracts the attention of many scholars: Dushkova (1969) examines the syntactic errors made by the Czech learner of the EL; Light & Warshawsky (1974) direct their observation to the Russian learners of the English, regarding the syntactic characteristics; Schachter (1982) analyzes the way the declarative sentences are generated by Persian, Arabic, Chinese and Japanese EL learners; Vassileva (1998) contrasts the use of the first person singular and plural from various native speakers, such as Germans, French, Russians and Bulgarians; Yang & Huang (2004) stress the Chinese language influence on the English language tense and aspect system acquisition considering that the Chinese do not have grammatical tense; Dost & Bohloulzadeh (2017) explore the Persian and the English language and reveal the similarities and dissimilarities in the syntax; Adiantika (2020) showcases the likeness and discrepancies in generating declarative sentences in the English and Indonesian; Samaila, Chinenye & Joekin (2020) point out to the sameness and distinctions in the use of affixes in the English and Hausa; Arjumand (2021) emphasizes the CA importance in creating teaching materials for the Bengali learners of the EL; Auni & Manan (2023) analyze the closeness and disparities between the adjectives in the English and Indonesian.

The English language influence on the Macedonian grammar (morphology and syntax) is investigated by Bosilkovska (2015), Kostadinovska-Stojchevska & Janusheva (2016), and Janusheva (2019; 2020; 2021; 2023). They scrutinize changes even in morphology which is considered as more closed and thus, not subjected to alterations. They also observe the syntax, where unusual combinations of words and word orders (w/o) appear and bring out a creation of English language sentences with Macedonian morphosyntactic rules.

3. Methodology

The sample in the present study represents formal descriptions of the grammatical systems of the two languages conventionalized and systematized in their respective reference grammar. The Macedonian language reference grammars used in this study are by: Lunt (1952), Koneski (1967), Friedman (2001), and the Minova-Gjurkova (2000); and the English language ones are by: Zandvoort (1977), Palmer (1978), Mihajlović (2006), Crystal (1978), and Eckersley & Eckersley (1980). The language classification is based on McArthur's Typology (1998). The juxtaposition relies upon the contrastive analysis.

4. Results, analysis, and discussion

The CA of the formal descriptions of the grammatical systems of the EL and ML, conventionalized in the reference grammar of each language, results with the following facts and insights:

The Macedonian language is spoken as a native language in the Republic of North Macedonia (RNM). As a second and official language it is used by the ethnic minorities in RNM. As immigrant language it is spoken in Australia, Germany, France, Italia, USA, Canada, Turkey, Switzerland, Sweden, and in many other countries. It is an Indo-European, Slavic, South Slavic, and East South Slavic language. In RNM, it is an official language and in Bulgaria, Greece, and Albania, it is used as a regional language. As the language of the Macedonian minority, it is spoken in the countries of the former SFRY, Bulgaria, Greece, and Albania. The scripts are Cyrillic – Macedonian variant.

The English language is considered as the language of the United Kingdom (UK), but it is spoken worldwide. The countries with native English language are the UK, USA, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. It is an Indo-European, German, and Western English language. Its scripts are Latin – Latin variant. The English language has official status in 54 countries including the Commonwealth countries, as well as. Interestingly, English is not the official language of the USA, but it is the most widely spoken language in the states with thirty-one of them declaring it as their official language. It is also one of the official languages of the European Union and many international organizations such as: UN, NAFTA, the African Union, the OIC, the CARICOM, the USAN, and many others. Nowadays, because it is spoken worldwide, it has a status of a *lingua franca*.

Accordingly, the contemporary EL is a dominant one not only in relation to the Macedonian, but in regard to most of the languages in the world as well.

4.1. Linguistic typology of English and Macedonian

McArthur (1998) claims that in view of the linguistic typology, the languages are usually classified at three levels: phonological, morphological, and syntactic.

At the morphological level, i.e. the structure of the word, McArthur distinguishes the language according to: a) the degree to which the morphemes create a word (isolative languages – one morpheme presents one word; agglutinative languages – more different morphemes generate a word that can be easily segmented; fusional languages or inflected languages – more (grammatical) morphemes flow into one another making a single combination, i.e., inflectional morpheme to cover, i.e., denote multiple grammatical, syntactic, or semantic features and meanings, and thus is hard, even impossible, to be segmented); b) number of morphemes in one word (analytical – one morpheme; synthetic – two or more morphemes, with the subgroup of inflected languages – when one word has many forms due to various bounded morphemes, for e.g.: *list/listovi/lisje* [*leaf/leaves*], polysynthetic – more morphemes in one word).

On the syntactical level, i.e. the sentence structure, the languages are often classified according the order of the subject, predicate, and object (subject – S, verb – V, and object – O). Having in mind that all languages do not have visibly expressed subject, usually the order of the predicate and the object is taken into consideration (VO).

In reality, many languages belong to the three above mentioned groups. However, one is always prevalent. Therefore, the languages are classified according to the most dominant group.

With this typology of both languages in view, although none of the languages can be determined as a stable member only to one language type, it can be said that the EL belongs to the so called root languages, i.e. the analytical or isolative languages, with some examples of inflection, whereas the ML is an inflected language, i.e. synthetic, but partially analytic. Hence, the morpheme-per-word ratio is higher in ML than in EL.

4.2. Morphology

In the EL, there are nine word groups: determiners, nouns, pronouns, adjectives, prepositions, verbs, adverbs, conjunctions, and interjections. Words which allow inflection, i.e. which are changeable are the nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs. Unchangeable words are the determiners, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions and the interjections. In the ML, there are eleven word groups which can be classified into changeable and unchangeable. The changeable words are the nouns, adjectives, numbers, pronouns, and the verbs. The unchangeable words are the

prepositions, conjunctions, particles, interjections and modal words. Some adverbs in the ML are changeable, thus the adverbs are a group between the changeable and unchangeable words.

The declension feature of the old EL (Anglo-Saxon) ends during the Middle English Language when the accusative and dative pronouns merge into object pronouns. *Who* and *whom*, *he* and *him*, *she* and *her* are, in fact, residual forms from the old nominative as opposed to the accusative and dative cases respectively. This means that *her*, for instance, is both an accusative and a dative version of the nominative pronoun *she*, but also regarded as a genitive pronoun. *Whom* is a generic objective pronoun which indicates the direct or indirect object. In the MEL, the nouns do not decline either, though some residual forms from the former pronoun system have remained. In the ML, there are long and short accusative/dative forms: *мене ме/ми* [*mene me/mi*], *него го/нему му* [*nego go/nemu mu*], *неа ја/нејзе ѝ* [*nea ja/nejze i*']; and for the example of *her* as a genitive pronoun – *нејзин* [*nejzin*]. As for the example of *whom*, the ML has respective forms for accusative and dative: *кого* [*kogo*] (*whom*); and *кому/на кого* [*komu/na kogo*] (*to whom*).

Morphologically, the MEL differentiates only one case – possessive genitive that some researchers see as a clitic, and not a case, although, as mentioned above, some linguists differentiate genitive pronouns.

The EL and ML do not have inflection for cases, i.e. they have analytic declination. This means that various grammatical relations among different parts of a sentence are expressed by prepositions and in the EL with prepositions and the word *w/o*. However, the EL does show some inflection features (*show, shows, showed, shown, showing*) and in the ML, there is a hesitation between analytical and inflectional processes such as in the example *Јас би одел* [*Jas bi odel*] (*I would go*) in which there is no inflection for modality and the modality is expressed by the clitic *би* [*bi*].

Unlike the ML, which is gendered language (grammatical gender and grammatical concordance of the words in the sentence according to the gender of the main noun), the EL is a natural gendered language and does not have congruence between the adjectives and nouns. When speaking of people and animals, there are nouns, with or without inflection, which denote masculine or feminine gender (*woman, lady, queen, princess, actress, heiress, lioness, cow, hen, she-goat*). The same applies to some objects and planets that are known to show masculine or feminine gender, mostly in literature, i.e. poetry (*Moon/ship, Sun*) as well as with adjectives which are used only for females or for males (*beautiful woman, but handsome man*).

While natural gender is associated with the person's sex, i.e. with nouns denoting the living beings of certain sex (female or male), in the ML, the grammatical gender is determined on the basis of the suffixes designating the gender of each noun, regardless of whether the noun indicates a living being or not, thus, making it a part of the gender system which consists of three grammatical genders – feminine, masculine and neuter. This means that the gender of nouns plays a crucial role when nouns appear as syntactic units, mostly, because the form of the other syntactic units depends on the noun gender, i.e. other units have to agree with the gender of the main noun within a phrase, which is not the case in the EL.

Given this difference in the gender systems of these two languages, the natural gender languages are known by the generic use of the nouns, meaning that the masculine noun refers to both sexes, i.e. teacher, ambassador, philosopher etc. Further, in the EL, there are pairs of nouns, one denoting the masculine and the other the feminine; the suffix *-ess* (*poet/poetess, actor/actress, and author/authoress*) is added to the male nouns. However, the research confirms that this way the term *man* is comprehended as a norm and the term *woman* as something that is derived and thus, secondary and less relevant.

In the ML, the situation is quite different. There are pairs of nouns, one denoting the masculine and the other the feminine gender in singular and in plural – with the use of the suffix *~ичка/~инка* [~it/ka]/[~inka], for e.g.: the m. and f. singular forms of the noun *teacher*: *наставник/наставничка* ['nastavnik/na'stavnit/ka], and its f. and m. plural forms: *наставници/наставнички* [na'stavnitsi/na'stavnit/ki]. In fact, the use of the feminine nouns derived from the masculine with a particular suffix is strongly recommended, imposed as a language norm, and seen as a mighty tool which comprehends the gender equality in the language.

However, the EL generic use influences the Macedonian learners and makes them prone to use generic masculine nouns instead of derived feminine nouns with the proper suffix. At the same time, following the EL trend of splitting *he* and *she* with a slash in texts, many Macedonian EFL learners, and speakers use this splitting in ML texts to indicate the gender equality between women and men. Unfortunately, this type of splitting is completely impossible and burdening in the whole sentence/text because the Macedonian Past Indefinite in/complete tense (perfect) is formed by the verb *to be* in Present Tense and different *l-forms* of the verb for each person and the f. and m. gender respectively. The following sentence with introduced slashes between m. and f. word forms: «*Onoj(m)/Onaa(f) dobriot(m)/dobrata(f) doktor(m)/doktorka(f) bil(m) /bila(f) na sostanokot*» (*That {m/f} good {m/f} doctor {m/f} has attended {m/f} the meeting*), is an obvious example that the sentence is full of slashes and double forms for masculine and feminine gender.

On the other hand, many Macedonian strategic documents and media texts contain EL models such as *woman/women + singular/plural masculine/feminine noun forms*: *жена тренер* [zena trener] (*woman trainer*), *жена академик* [zena akademik] (*woman academician*), *жени филозофи* [zeni filozofi] (*women philosophers*), *жени пожарникарки* [zeni pozhanikarki] (*women firewomen*). These models draw on English texts as a means to boost women's visibility. Such models are specific for non-gendered languages like the EL and do not apply to gendered language like the ML in which only singular/plural feminine forms are used to denote person's female gender. The insights about the gender of the nouns are in correlation with the research by Janusheva (2023).

In addition, the EL has one specific feature unlike the ML, i.e., the personal pronouns for 2nd person singular and plural share the same form – *you* along with the auxiliary verbs *to be/have/do* as well as the other verbs in Present Simple Tense only in their plural form (*are/were* for the Past Simple Tense; *have; do;*), which may lead to Macedonian EFL speakers' confusion. When two EL interlocutors use the *you* form, Macedonian EFL learners and speakers do not know whether these forms are singular or plural, nor whether they are formal or informal. The ML has two types of singular pronouns for the English *you*: *mu* [ti] (*you*) and *B(ε)ue* [V(v)ie]. The latter type *Bue* [Vie] (*You*), always capitalized in formal writing and of plural form is used when addressing one person only to show politeness and due respect to the other speaker/recipient. The lowercase of this pronoun within a statement in writing (except when the statement itself begins with this pronoun), i.e., *eue* [vie] (*you*), indicates that the sender addresses many people. The EL model of formal addressing a recipient with "*Dear...*", on the other hand, is rather strange for Macedonian EFL learners, based on the research results by Kostadinovska & Janusheva (2016) who have detected this situation in an analysis of an EL interview posted on You Tube.

As a result of the EL influence, or language transfer EL(L2) > ML(L1), a new more specific feature has appeared in the ML, which is against the rules of ML grammar. This novelty is the use of noun plural forms characteristic for the EL but not conventionalized in the ML grammar. This occurrence affects the morphosyntactic level in the ML discourse when various sentence parts should be congruent. Such examples which have plural forms in the EL and have intruded the ML

are: amnesties, affirmations, evolutions, identities, insufficiencies, jurisdictions, compensations, orientations, partnerships, plastics, populations, practices, substitutions etc. These results are in line with Janusheva's research findings (2020).

The suppletion is present in both of the languages: in the EL, in the nouns, adjectives, some pronouns, verbs, and adverbs, and in the ML, in the pronouns, some nouns, adjectives, adverbs and the auxiliary verb *sum* (to be). Most frequent examples in the EL are the present and past tense forms of the verbs *be*: *am, is, are, was, were, been*; and *go*: *go, went*; the degrees of comparison of some adjectives such as *good/better/best*; and *bad/worse/worst*, and in the ML the present, past, future tense, and perfect forms of to be *сум* [*sum*]; the comparative of the adjective *многу* [*mnogu*] *повеќе* [*'povece*], *човек* [*tʃovek*] *луѓе* [*luje*].

In the EL, the definite article is equivalent to the postpositive article in the ML whereas the indefinite article of the EL finds its translational equivalent in the ML number "one" and the expression "certain".

In the ML, the infinitive has completely vanished, i.e., it is replaced with the particle "to" – *да* [*da*] and the present simple, according to person and number.

The ML double object and short pronoun forms do not exist in the EL.

The ML uses double negation which is not standard for the EL, except in street talks and among people of lower education. This feature causes interference in the use of EFL.

In the EL, there are twelve grammatical tenses, and in the ML, there are nine. However, aside from the difference in number and names of the tenses, there are inequalities between them that cause interference, which requires a more thorough and elaborative explanation starting from the very verbs and their categorization in the two languages.

The ML and EL have one more common analytical characteristic, i.e. the use of the auxiliary verb *have* with past participle, i.e. the perfect aspect: *има* [*ima*] with verbal adjective (equivalent to the EL past participle): *I have read the book* – *Јас ја имам прочитано книгата* [*jas ja imam 'protʃitano 'knigata*], *I had read it* – *(Јас) ја имав прочитано* [*jas ja imav 'protʃitano*], *I will have read it* – *(Јас) ќе ја имам прочитано* [*jas ce ja imam 'protʃitano*]. The ML keeps the inflection in the auxiliary verb for person, number and tense, whereas the EL for present tense – *have* for all persons, and *has* for 3rd person singular, for past tense – the form *had*, and for future – *will/shall have*.

The EL *be* which is used as an auxiliary verb in some tenses and constructions has an equivalent in the Macedonian verb *биде* [*bide*]. However, some of the uses differ in the two languages and may cause interference, for instance: *I was born* and *Јас сум роден* [*jas sum roden*].

The status of modality in the EL and ML verbs, with the number and role of the *modal verbs* in the EL, and the different category of words for expressing modality, i.e., the so called *modal words* in the ML, requires more space and an exhaustive CA in some future research study, though insights gained so far have shown Macedonian EFL learners and speakers' are more confused with the wide spectrum of uses that the EL modals have rather than with the Macedonian modal words as possible interference obstacle.

Regarding the affixation, unlikely to the EL, the ML has a special feature of multi-prefixation of the verb forms; up to three or even four prefixes can be added to the front of a root or stem of the verb: *из|на|пу|кажа* [*izna'prikazha*] from *каже* [*kazha* < *prikazha* < *napirkazha* < *iznaprikazha*] (talked a lot about certain topic/s), *нод|из|ваду* [*podizvadi*] from *ваду* (pulled/took something out, but only a small part/portion/quantity of it, not the whole of it/everything). In some case, this prefixation has a) grammatical function, in others b) semantic, whereas in third situations c) both semantic and grammatical: a) *чума* – *по|чума* [*tʃita – protʃita*] > grammatical function

of completed action of reading; b) *npaua* – *nom|npaua* [*prafa* – *potprafa*] – semantic function with the meaning of making a small and unobtrusive inquiry; c) *из|на|нпо|чума* [*iznaprotfita*] > semantic and grammatical function completion of the activity of reading which above all covered nearly everything regarding the types of publication, topic, or genre. The EL is also known for affixation but not of this type. CA on the basis of translation equivalents would reveal much of this issue.

4.3. Syntax

As an analytic language, the EL depends on the strict word order (w/o) in the sentences. The w/o in the ML, which is also analytic, is to some degree freer. Although in both languages the most frequent construction is SVO, the ML offers possibilities for other constructions whose information character is assisted with the sentence stress. Yet, it has to be pointed out that this freedom of changing the words order is limited.

Thus, the ML has these sentence constructions: «a) *Petre go udri Tome*; b) *Tome go udri Petre*; c) *Go udri Tome Petre*; d) *Go udri Petre Tome* » the literal translation of which would be: a) *Petre hits Tome*; b) *Tome hits Petre*; c) *Hits Tome Petre*; and d) *Hits Petre Tome*. All these statements are quite clear and comprehensible in the ML if the correct sentence stress is used. In these examples the proper noun *Petre* is the doer of the action regardless of the fact that it does not take the position of the grammatical subject in all of the examples. In the written form, statements of these types are understood correctly only within the context, i.e. without a context the expression would not make it clear who is the subject and who is the object of the action of hitting. In the EL, the only correct structure equivalent to the ML example would be the one under a) *Petre* is the subject; the b) would give wrong information, whereas c) and d) are syntactically unacceptable in the EL.

Another interference of the EL as a newly acquired foreign language is the EL w/o characteristic when reducing prepositional phrases. More precisely, nowadays, in the ML there are many examples indicating the influence of this EL reduction. For e.g., *mun A проекту* [*tip A 'proekti*], instead of *проекту од муном A* [*'proekti od tipot A*] (*type A projects – projects of the type A*); *Амазон интернет-продавницата* [*Amazon 'internet-pro'davnicata*] instead of [*pro'davnicata na 'internet (на) Amazon*] (*Amazon Internet shop – the Internet shop (of) Amazon*). This is in line with the research by Janusheva (2021).

The interference of the EFL does not stop here. The one of which an example follows below has become frequent and it affects the ML rule of placing the predicate as close as possible to the connective/relative pronoun/clause marker. As a result, lately, in the ML practice of translation, the predicate follows the EL w/o, and the result is English syntax in the Macedonian language discourse. For instance, the Macedonian translation of the EL sentence *...The Republic of Macedonia represents a transit area through which a part of international routes (Cl-S) passes (Cl-P)...*, rendered as «... *Republika Makedonija pretstavuva tranzitna oblast preku koja del od megjunarodnite ruti (Cl-S) pominuvaat (Cl-P)...*», should be structured «...*preku koja pominuvaat (Cl-P) del od megjunarodnite ruti (Cl-S) ...*» These findings are in correlation with Janusheva's research (2021).

The syntactic constraints in the ML caused by its grammatical gender and grammatical concordance of the words in a sentence also reflect on the agreement between acronyms and the predicate. In the ML, this accordance should be done according to the noun which is the center of the noun group, a rule which in the EL is not quite discernable due to the neuter gender of nouns referring to offices, institutions, organizations, associations, etc. For e.g., the translation of the

sentence *OLAF* (*Office de Lutte Antifraude*) was created... as «*ОЛАФ е формиран...*» [*OLAF e formiran...*] is incorrect if taken into account that *OLAF* is an acronym created from the initial letters of the French name which in literal translation in ML means *Канцеларија за борба против измама* [*Kancelarija za borba protiv izmama*]. As the Macedonian noun *Канцеларија* [*kancelarija*] is a feminine noun the congruity of the verb form should be in accordance with it, i.e. *ОЛАФ е формирана...* [*OLAF e formirana...*]. The insights confirm previous Janusheva's research (2019).

Additionally, Macedonian EFL learners and speakers experience interference with the EL possessive adjectives *his*, *her*, *its*, and *their*, and almost regularly translate them as *негов/а/о/и*; *нејзин/а/о/и*, and *нивен/а/о/и* even when they mean *one's own*. In the EL the interlocutors know whose possession the pronoun refers to on the basis of the context. But in the Macedonian language there is a different form of possessive adjective to refer to something which is one's own, and that is *свој/а/е/и* [*svoj/a/e/i*]. For e.g., *his* in the sentence *He brought his books* has two meanings: either his own or someone else's books. When interference occurs, the Macedonian EFL learner/speaker translates the sentence *Toj ги донесе неговите книги* [*Toj gi donese negovite knigi*] the meaning is shifted to someone else's books, thus deteriorating the conveyance of the genuine message. This is in accordance with Minova-Gjurkova's (2000) and Janusheva's (2020) findings.

5. Conclusion

This qualitative paper, which contrasts the Macedonian and the English language, indicates that the differences between the grammatical systems of the ML and the EL do cause language transfer across both languages – $ML(L1) > EL(L2) > ML(L1)$, i.e., Macedonian learners and speakers have the tendency of using Macedonian morphological and syntactic rules when writing and speaking in English, and vice versa, they use some acquired English structures when translating from English into Macedonian. Some of these differences which cause interference are: a) The EL is a natural gendered language whereas the ML is grammatically gendered language; b) the EL personal pronouns for 2nd person singular and plural share the same form – *you* whereas the ML has two types of the 2nd person singular *mu* [*ti*] (*you*) and *B(e)ue* [*V(v)ie*]; the capitalized *Bue* [*vie*] (*You*) used to indicate due respect and politeness and the lowercased one, i.e., *bue* [*vie*] (*you*), used when addressing many people; c) EL nouns which have both singular and plural forms whereas the ML conventionalized ones are of singular form only; d) the conventionalized EL does not use double negation like the ML, except in street talks and among people of lower education; e) difference in number and names of grammatical tenses between EL and ML, and differences in what action/activity they refer to respectively; f) some of the uses of the EL *be* which has an equivalent in the Macedonian verb *биде* [*bide*] differ from those in the ML; g) the wide range of uses that the EL modals have versus the modal words in the ML; h) the multi-prefixation of the verb forms in the ML as an obstacle to expressing oneself in EFL; i) strict w/o in the EL versus the freer w/o in the ML; j) the EL reduction of prepositional phrases versus the ML conventionalized order in phrases; k) EL clauses retain the Subject + Predicate order, whereas ML clauses have Predicate+Subject order after a clause marker/connective/relative pronoun; l) the EL structure does not require congruence of the verb following an EL acronym, as the acronym is always of neuter gender whereas in the ML, the acronym is gendered according to the noun functioning as the axis of the acronym; m) additionally, the EL possessive pronouns *his*, *her*, *its*, and *their* do not denote whether they refer to possession of the speaker or somebody else's. The ML has different pronouns to denote one's own possession.

All these findings encourage further and thorough research of each of the stated causes separately, both for the sake of reducing interference issues in learning EFL and enhancement of EFL communicative and translational skills.

References

- Adiantika, N. Hanif. 2020. "Contrastive Analysis between Indonesian and English Declarative Sentences". *ELT in Focus* 3(1): 15-25, doi: 10.35706/eltinf.v3i1.3695.
- Auni, Luthfi, and Manan, Abdul. 2023. "A contrastive analysis of morphological and syntactic aspects of English and Indonesian adjectives". *Studies in English Language and Education* 10(1), 403-23,
doi: <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i1.27401>.
- Babiker M. Mohyeldeen, Ahmad M. Ahmad, and Ahmed B. A. Saad. (2023). "Contrastive Analysis of Adjectives of Quality of English and Fur Languages". *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: English Language, Teaching, Communication, Literature and Linguistics* 4(1): 111-24.
- Bosilkovska, Stela. 2015. *Glasovite vo angliskiot, vo makedonskiot i vo srpskiot jazik i mozhnata interferencija koja vodi do greshki pri tolkuvanjeto politichki govori* [The sounds of the English, Macedonian and Serbian language and the possible interference which leads to mistakes when interpreting political speeches]. Unpublished master thesis. Skopje: Filoloshki fakultet „B. Koneski“.
- Crystal, David. 1992. *Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Dost, N. Islam, and Bohloulzadeh, Ghassem. 2017. "A Review of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis with a Phonological and Syntactical view: A Cross-Linguistic Study". *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 32-41.
- Dušková, Libuše. 1969. "On Sources of Error in Foreign Language Learning". *International Review of Applied Linguistics (IRAL)* 7(1): 11-36.
- Eckersley E. Charles & Eckersley M. John. 1980. *A Comprehensive English Grammar: for Foreign Students*. Longman.
- Friedman, V. (2002). *Macedonian*. (Languages of the World/Materials 117). Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Fries, C. Charles. 1945. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Huyen, T. Nguyen. 2021. "Contrastive Analysis of Consonants in English and Vietnamese". *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* 3(6) 58-65.
- Janusheva, Violeta. 2019. "Za akronimite vo novinarskiot potstil na makedonskiot standarden jazik" [The acronyms in the journalistic sub style of the modern Macedonian language], In: *Zbornik od Megjunarodnata nauchna konferencija: "Unapreduvanje na statusot i korpusot na makedonskiot standarden jazik – Racin i makedonskiot jazik"*, 2019, 41-54. Skopje: UKIM i Institut za makedonski jazik "K. Misirkov".
- Janusheva, Violeta. 2020. "Mnozhinata na imenkite shto se upotrebuvaat samo vo ednina vo makedonskiot standarden jazik" [The plural of the nouns which are used only in singular in the Macedonian standard language], In: *Zbornik od Megjunarodnata nauchna konferencija "Makedonskiot jazik – izvor na filoloshki i kulturoloshki istrazhuvanja"*, 2019, 149-160. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik "K. Misirkov".

Janusheva, Violeta. 2021. "Vlijaniето na angliskiot vrz makedonskiот jazik" [The influence of the English on Macedonian language], In: *Zbornik od Megjunarodniот nauchen sobir "Denovi na Blagoja Korubin"*, 2020, 167-78. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik "K. Misirkov".

Janusheva, Violeta. 2023. "The Gender-Specific Nouns Denoting Profession/Role: The Macedonian Case". *A Journal on Language and Language Teaching* 26(1): 115-133, doi.org/10.24071/llt.v26i1.5645.

Jespersen, Otto. 1912. *How to Teach a Foreign Language*. London: George Allen.

Koneski, B. (1967). *Gramatika na makedonskiот literaturnen jazik* [Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language]. Skopje: Kultura.

Kostadinovska, Bisera, and Janusheva, Violeta. 2016. "Forms for Addressing in the Macedonian and English Language – Trends in the Television Shows". *International Journal of Science and Research* 5(2): 463-69.

Lado, Robert. 1968. *Linguistic across Culture: Applied Linguistic for Language Teacher*. An Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lunt, G. Horas. 1952. *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*. Skopje: Državno knigoizdatelstvo na NR Makedonija.

Minova-Gjurkova, Liljana. 2000. *Sintaksa na makedonskiот standarden jazik* [Syntax of the Macedonian Standard Language]. Skopje: Rading.

Mihajlović, Ljiljana. (2006). *Gramatika engleskog jezika, 18. izd.* [English Language Grammar]. Beograd: Nauchna KMD.

Palmer, F. (1978). *Grammar*. Penguin Books.

Samaila, B. Zubairu, Chinenye, K. Kadiri, and Joekin, Ekwueme. 2020. "Comparative Study of English and Hausa Affixation". *Academic Journal of Current Research* 7(11). An official Publication of Center for International Research Development.

Schachter, Jacquelyn. 1983. "A new account of language transfer", in Gass, S. and Selinker, L (eds.). *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 98-111.

Vassileva, Irena. 1998. "Who am I/how are we in academic writing? A contrastive analysis of authorial presence in English, German, French, Russian and Bulgarian". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8(2), 163-85.

Zandvoort, R.Willem. 1977. *A Handbook of English Grammar*. Longman