

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF TENSE AND ASPECT SYSTEMS IN ENGLISH AND JULA

By

Rofiat Omotayo Abdulkareem-Seidu

Department of Languages (English Unit)

Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria

+2349069108570

rofabdulkareem@gmail.com

Abstract

Tense and aspect are fundamental grammatical categories that enable speakers to express temporal relations and the internal structure of events. This study carried out a contrastive analysis of tense and aspect in Julia and English to identify structural similarities and differences between the tense and aspect systems of the two languages. This was achieved by describing the tense and aspect systems of Julia and English; comparing how both languages express temporal and aspectual relations; and identifying potential areas of difficulty for Julia speakers learning English as a second language. The study adopted a qualitative descriptive approach and data were selected using Purposive Sampling Technique. The data consisted of group A and group B which are non-educated native speakers of Julia who cannot speak English, and educated native speakers of Julia who are fluent in English and can translate Julia words and expressions into English Language. The analysis was carried out on the tenets of Noam Chomsky's Universal Grammar (UG) and Robert Lado's Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH); and focused on key tense and aspect categories. Findings revealed that while English has a more morphologically complex tense system with clear grammatical markers for tense and aspect, Julia relies on particles and context-dependent constructions to express temporal reference and aspectual distinctions. The study concluded that these differences may result in negative-transfer and pose challenges for Julia learners of English and thus should be given attention during teaching and learning to enhance learners' mastery of tense and aspect in English.

Keywords: Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, Universal Grammar, second language learning, language pedagogy

1.0 Introduction

Tense and aspect are fundamental grammatical categories that enable speakers to express temporal relations and the internal structure of events. Contrastive Analysis (CA) has been instrumental in identifying structural differences and potential areas of interference in second language acquisition. For instance, Sutrisno and Sari (2018) conducted a contrastive analysis of tense and aspect in English and Indonesian. This study revealed significant differences in verb forms and temporal expressions in the two languages. Similarly, Akmal et al. (2020) examined sentence patterns in English and Sigulai and highlighted variations in tense usage and sentence structure. These studies explained the importance of contrastive analysis in analysing language-specific features and language universal features in language teaching and learning. However, despite the insights provided by these previous, there remains a notable gap in the literature concerning the contrastive analysis of tense and aspect in English and Jula. The lack of such studies poses a potential challenge faced by Jula speakers learning English. Bridging this gap is the main concern of this present research. This study aimed to compare and analyse the grammatical systems of tense and aspect in English and Jula languages and this aim was achieved by identifying the the major tense and aspect categories in English and Jula; examining the similarities and differences in the way tense and aspect are expressed in both languages and explaining the implications of these differences for second language learning and teaching. These objectives of the study prompted the following research questions that helped guide the analysis of the data.

- What are the major tense and aspect categories in English and Jula?
- How are tense and aspect structurally realised in both languages?
- What are the points of divergence that may cause learning difficulties for native speakers of Jula learning English?

English Language

English is the primary language in the UK, US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and many former British colonies. It is also widely taught globally as

a foreign language and used in diplomacy and technology. English belongs to the Indo-European family, specifically the Germanic subfamily, closely related to Frisian, Dutch, Flemish, and German (Binnick, 2011).

Jula Language

Jula (also spelt as Dyula/Dioula) belongs to the Mande language family and is spoken in Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire and Mali. It expresses tense and aspect mainly through particles and auxiliaries rather than inflection. For example, *ka* marks future tense, while *ye* can indicate perfective aspect (Brindle, 2011). Jula has a complex tense-aspect-modality system, with markers including suffixes and prefixes (e.g., *-i* for past, *ka-* for future) (Kastenholz, 2003). It is a widely spoken lingua franca in West Africa, with millions of speakers and strong cultural heritage (Keita, 1990).

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Universal Grammar (UG)

Universal Grammar is the theory that humans are innately equipped with the capacity to acquire language. Since the 1940s, it has become central to modern linguistic research, especially within generative grammar (Chomsky, 1965). It proposes that all languages share fundamental grammatical categories and relations, enabling speakers to generate infinite expressions from finite rules. There, in UG, grammar must therefore contain a finite system of rules that produces countless deep and surface structures, while linking them to sound and meaning through universal phonetics and semantics. Chomsky (1981) traces the intellectual roots of this idea to earlier thinkers such as Panini, Plato, Descartes (1647), Vaugelas (1647), DuMarsais (1729), Diderot (1751), Beattie (1788), and Humboldt (1836). He highlights the Port Royal grammarians, particularly Lancelot and Arnauld's *Grammaire générale et raisonnée* (1660), which connected the natural order of thought to word order and laid the foundation for modern syntactic theory.

The Head Parameter in Universal Grammar

One of the central parameters of language variation is the position of the head in phrases. In many languages, the default word order is Subject- Object- Verb (SOV), though OSV also occurs. Importantly, nothing may follow the finite verb. When the object precedes the subject, a particle

marks the subject to clarify its role. Nominal modifiers (adjectives, numerals, demonstratives) follow the head noun, which is unusual among SOV languages. Genitives and relative clauses also come after the noun. These languages employ numerous postpositions that assimilate to the preceding word and function as subordinators or complementizers (Baker, 1988). English typically follows a Subject- Verb- Object- Adjunct (SVOA) order, though variations are possible depending on context. Other languages may favor ASVO order but can also shift to SVOA depending on usage.

2.2 Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH)

Robert Lado's Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH), first articulated in his seminal work *Linguistics Across Cultures* (1957), remains one of the most influential early theories in second language acquisition. Building on the structuralist tradition of linguistics and the behaviorist view of learning, Lado argued that the primary source of learner errors stems from differences between the learner's native language (L1) and the target language (L2). According to CAH, similarities between the two languages facilitate learning through positive transfer, while differences create difficulties through negative transfer or interference. This predictive model was intended to help language teachers anticipate areas of difficulty and design instructional materials accordingly. The hypothesis was strongly influenced by earlier pedagogical insights from Fries (1945), who emphasized the role of native language habits in shaping foreign language learning. While the strong version of CAH claimed that all learner errors could be predicted by systematic comparison of L1 and L2, subsequent research revealed that not all differences result in errors and not all similarities guarantee ease of learning. This led to the development of a weaker version of CAH, which emphasised explaining errors after they occur rather than predicting them in advance. Despite criticisms, CAH has remained a valuable framework, particularly in applied linguistics and language pedagogy, where it continues to inform contrastive studies such as those comparing English with African languages like Julia.

2.3 Previous works on Contrastive Analysis of English and Julia

Previous works on the contrastive analysis of English and Julia (Dioula) have consistently drawn on the foundational principles of contrastive linguistics established by Fries (1945) and Lado (1957). Fries emphasized the importance

of comparing native and target languages to anticipate learner difficulties, while Lado's *Linguistics across cultures* provided a systematic framework for applied linguistics in language teaching. Building on this tradition, Djigimide (2020) examined the relative ease of learning Jula versus English, focusing on phonological contrasts such as Jula's tonal system compared to English's stress-based prosody. His work highlighted how Jula speakers often struggle with English vowel length and consonant clusters, while English speakers face challenges with tonal distinctions in Jula. Teaching-oriented resources, such as the National Open University of Nigeria's *ENG 812: Contrastive Linguistics* (2022), have also incorporated Jula into broader African language comparisons and emphasised its agglutinative morphology against English's analytic structure and predicting learner errors in tense and aspect marking. Bouayad (2019) contributed by clarifying the aims and procedures of contrastive analysis, applying them to African languages and noting pragmatic differences in politeness and indirectness between Jula and English that can lead to miscommunication.

3.0 Methodology

The samples for this study were selected using Purposive Sampling Technique to ensure that the data were relevant and met the criteria for the study. The samples comprised two groups of speakers: group A are native speakers of Jula who are not educated and cannot speak English. Group B on the other hand, includes educated native speakers of Jula who can also speak English and can translate Jula words and expressions into English Language for better understanding. Each group consists of five speakers making a total of ten persons. They interacted using marketing discourse which indicated the use of different tenses and aspects in Jula. These sets of speakers were specifically chosen because the monolingual speakers are more fluent in Jula and are familiar with deep expressions in the language while the educated English-Jula bilingual speakers, on the other hand, are familiar with English expressions and can provide exact use of such expressions in Jula.

4.0 Data Analysis and Presentation

4.0 Introduction

This analysis examined how tense and aspect are expressed in Jula and English.

4.1 Datum 1

Jula Expression: “I niwula, Logo be di?”

English Equivalent: Good morning, how is the market?

In Jula, “I niwula” means “Good morning” and this greeting is a timeless and culturally fixed expression. While in the expression *Logo be di*, *Logo* means “market”, *be* serves as a locative or existential particle while *di* means “to be good/fine”.

Analysis

In Jula, there is no morphological tense marker in the Jula sentence and the context is used to show present just like we have *Be* (existential verb) + adjective “di” (fine) in the sentence. In the English equivalent on the other hand, the present simple of “to be” is used to express current state and is morphologically marked with “is”. This showcases how the two languages convey similar meanings through different grammatical strategies. While English explicitly encodes tense morphologically and obligatorily with “is”, Jula employs aspectual and existential particles like *be* without morphological inflection to suit the context. Also, in terms of aspect marking, both languages express stative aspects to express condition or state of being but use different structures; while English uses copula + predicate adjective; Jula uses *be* + *di*.

4.2 Datum 2

Jula: *Nsee! Logo ka fi sa*

English: Good morning, market is doing better

Jula: *Nsee!* Is a timeless expression used for greeting or saying good morning. *Logo* means market, *ka* is an auxiliary particle that indicate future/progressive aspect, *fi* is verb which means “do” while *sa* means better

Analysis

The Jula expression *Nsee! Logo ka fi sa* translates to “Good morning, the market is doing better.” The greeting *Nsee!* is a timeless cultural salutation, much like *I niwula* in the earlier example. The clause *Logo ka fi sa* breaks down into *Logo* (market), *ka* (auxiliary particle signaling progressive or future-like action), *fi* (verb “do”), and *sa* (intensifier meaning “better” or

“more”). In *Jula*, tense is not morphologically marked on the verb itself; instead, the auxiliary particle *ka* provides the progressive sense, that shows that the market is in a state of ongoing improvement. The aspect here is progressive combined with comparative, as *fi sa* conveys the idea of “doing better.”

In English, the equivalent “The market is doing better” employs the present progressive tense, explicitly marked by the auxiliary “is” plus the inflected verb “doing.” The comparative improvement is expressed through “better.” Unlike *Jula*, English relies on morphological inflection to mark tense and aspect, making the structure more explicit. Both languages, however, convey the same semantic meaning: the market is improving. The difference lies in their grammatical strategies because *Jula* uses particles like *ka* and context to indicate tense and aspect while English uses auxiliary verbs and inflectional morphology.

4.3 Datum 3

Jula: I bi ka samara feere jolijoli?

English: How much are you selling your shoes?

Jula: *I* – “you”, *bi* – auxiliary/copula indicating present tense, *ka* – future/progressive marker *samara* – verb “sell”, *feere* – noun “shoes” and *jolijoli* – reduplication to indicate variety, style or emphasis.

Analysis

In *Jula*, the phrase *bi kasamaraw* conveys the idea of “they are selling” through a combination of auxiliary particles rather than verb inflection. The particle *bi* signals present tense, while *ka* marks the action as ongoing or progressive, so the construction expresses that the selling is happening now. The verb *samara* itself remains in its base form, showing that *Jula* relies on syntactic markers rather than morphological changes. In English, the equivalent “are selling” uses the auxiliary *are* to mark present tense and the participial form *selling* to indicate progressive aspect. This highlights a key structural difference: English verbs undergo inflection (*sell* → *selling*), while *Jula* verbs remain unchanged, with tense and aspect carried by particles. Both languages, however, achieve the same semantic effect of describing an ongoing present action. Additionally, *Jula* employs reduplication, such as

jolijoli, to emphasize qualities or style, a feature not directly mirrored in English but sometimes implied through context. Overall, the comparison underscores the analytic nature of Julia, which depends on auxiliary particles like *bi* and *ka*, versus the inflectional nature of English, which encodes tense and aspect morphologically.

4.4 Datum 4

“Waa fila-fila” (10,000 each)

Julia: Waa – “ten thousand” (numeral) and Fila-fila – “each” (distributive reduplication)

English Translation: “10,000 each”

Analysis

In Julia, the nominal expression *waafila-fila* functions as a distributive pricing response, typically used when someone asks “How much is it?” Unlike verbal clauses, this structure does not explicitly mark tense or aspect. Instead, it combines a numeral (*waa*, meaning “10,000”) with reduplication (*fila-fila*) to indicate equal distribution or per-unit cost. English expresses the same idea with “10,000 each,” which also lacks tense or aspect but conveys distributive meaning through the quantifier *each*. Both languages rely on context to imply present relevance—essentially, “This item costs 10,000 now” without grammatical markers of time or progression. The key difference lies in how distribution is encoded: Julia uses reduplication as a syntactic strategy, while English employs a dedicated quantifier. In both cases, the phrase is a nominal expression rather than a full sentence, serving a pragmatic function in economic exchanges rather than a grammatical one.

4.5 Datum 5

Julia: *Samarawcekayninga o songokagwele de*

English Translation: “They are beautiful shoes but very expensive.”

Julia: *Samaraw* – shoes, *ce* – plural marker, *kayni* – they are good/beautiful (*ka* marks present state), *nga* – but *o songo* – they are expensive and *kagwele de* – very (emphatic intensifier) English: “They are beautiful shoes but very expensive.”

Analysis

In both Jula and English, the way present time and aspect are expressed reveals very different grammatical strategies. Jula relies on particles such as *ka*, *ce*, or *o* to indicate tense and aspect, rather than conjugating verbs. So when Jula speakers want to show present time, they simply use these particles in context, without altering the verb form itself. English, on the other hand, makes tense explicit through conjugation, as seen in the use of *are*, the present tense of *to be*. Aspect in both languages here is stative, meaning it describes a state of being rather than an action in progress. In Jula, this aspect is often understood through context and auxiliary particles, while in English it is directly expressed through the verb *to be*. Structurally, Jula leans on particles and flexible word order, whereas English follows stricter subject-verb agreement rules and inflectional morphology. This contrast highlights the analytic nature of Jula, where meaning is carried by particles and context, compared to the inflectional system of English, where verbs themselves change form to mark tense and aspect.

4.6 Datum 6

Jula: *Kasoro a kanogodooni do*

English Translation: Meanwhile, it is a price that's a bit affordable.

structure : *Kasoro* – meanwhile, *a* – it (subject pronoun), *ka* – present tense/stative marker, *nogo* – price, *dooni do* – a bit affordable / a little (emphatic repetition)

English: “Meanwhile” – time adverbial, “it is a price” – copular structure, “that’s a bit affordable” relative clause with degree modifier

Analysis

Here, both Jula and English are describing a present state, but they do so with very different grammatical strategies. In Jula, the particle *ka* serves as a stative marker, showing that something “is” in a certain condition, while English uses the fully conjugated copula *is*. The aspect in both cases is stative, meaning the expression conveys a condition or state of being rather than an action in progress. For example, in Jula, *ka* combined with *nogo* (price) and modifiers

like dooni do communicate affordability as a current state. English achieves the same through a copular sentence such as “It is a bit affordable.”

Modifiers also reveal interesting contrasts. Jula uses reduplication (dooni do) to emphasize degree, a common strategy in Mande languages, while English uses adjectives with degree modifiers like a bit or slightly. Temporal or discourse markers show another parallel: Jula’s kasoro sets the time context, much like English’s meanwhile, which signals a temporal or transitional frame in discourse. Both languages express present tense and stative aspect, but Jula leans on particles, reduplication and contextual markers, whereas English relies on conjugated verbs, quantifiers and adjectives.

4.7 Datum 7

Jula: Barika

English Translation: Can you make a discount for me?

Jula: *Barika* – a single lexical item functioning as a polite request or appeal for discount, contextually dependent. It implies “can you reduce the price?” Jula often relies on pragmatic context, tone, and shared cultural knowledge.

English: “Can” – modal verb (present tense, expressing ability or permission), “you make” – verb phrase (present tense) and “a discount for me” – noun phrase indicating the request

Analysis

In Jula, the polite request barika operates quite differently from its English counterpart “can you make a discount.” Tense in Jula is not explicitly marked here; instead, the listener interprets the word as referring to the present or immediate future depending on the situation. English, however, makes tense clear through the modal verb can, which is in the present tense. Aspect is also handled differently: Jula does not use aspectual markers in this context, since the focus is on the request itself rather than the progression of an action. English expresses a simple, non-progressive aspect through the verb phrase “make a discount.”

Modality and politeness are embedded directly into barika, with tone and social norms guiding how the request is received. In English, politeness is framed explicitly through the modal verb can, which signals possibility and

softens the request. Structurally, *Jula* implies the action without a separate verb, while English requires a full verb phrase to make the request explicit. This contrast highlights how *Jula* relies on context, particles and intonation to convey meaning, whereas English uses grammatical markers and modal verbs to achieve clarity and politeness. Both systems are effective, but they showcase very different strategies for embedding social nuance into everyday language.

4.8 Datum 8

Jula: Na niwaakelennikeme see seegi ye

English Translation: You can bring 9000 for each

Jula: Na ni– “you can”, *waakelen*– “each”, *nikeme* – “9000”, *see* – “bring”, *seegi ye*– “for it” or “as price”.

English: You can bring – modal verb + main verb (present tense), 9000 – numeral and for each– prepositional phrase.

Analysis

In *Jula*, the polite request *nani see* (“please bring”) conveys possibility or permission without explicitly marking tense. The expression is understood as present or near-future depending on the context, since *Jula* verbs are not inflected for tense. English, by contrast, makes tense explicit through the modal verb *can*, which signals present or future potential. Aspects in both languages are simple because there is no progressive or perfect marker here, just a straightforward request for an action. Modality is central to the comparison. *Jula* uses *nani* to imply permission or ability, embedding the polite force within the particle itself, while English relies on the modal *can* to frame the request overtly. Structurally, *Jula* keeps the verb *see* (“bring”) in its base form, with meaning drawn from context and auxiliary particles. English follows a more rigid format, combining the modal with a base verb to form a complete phrase (“can bring”). This indicates that politeness and modality are often contextual and particle-driven in *Jula* unlike in English, where explicit grammatical markers are used to convey ability, permission or politeness.

4.9 Datum 9

Jula: A kagwelehalibi, I be se kanin samara nin di n ma waakelenwa?

English Translation: It is still expensive, can you sell these shoes for me for 5000?

Jula: *A kagwelehalibi* – “It is still expensive”, *I be se* – “Can you”, *kanin samara nin di*– “sell these shoes” and *n ma waakelenwa* – “for me for 5000?”

English: It is still expensive – present tense, Can you sell – modal + base verb and these shoes for me for 5000 – object + recipient + price

Analysis

In Jula, the polite construction *be se* (“can sell”) conveys possibility or a polite request without overt inflection for tense or aspect. Tense is understood contextually because *kagwelehalibi* signals a present state, and *be se* suggests a present or near-future polite request. English, by contrast, marks tense explicitly with the modal *can*, which operates in the present tense but can also imply future potential. Aspects in both languages are simple: neither progressive nor perfect is indicated, so the action is hypothetical or requested rather than ongoing or completed. Modality and politeness are expressed differently in Jula because the language embeds modality in the particle *be*, with politeness inferred from context and tone, while English uses the modal *can* in a structured phrase like “can you sell” to make the request clear and polite. Verb construction also differs: Jula keeps the verb *se* (“sell”) in its base form after *be*, showing ability or potential without morphological change. English requires the modal plus base verb format (*can sell*), maintaining grammatical clarity through explicit syntax. Jula relies on particles and contextual interpretation, while English uses a rigid modal + verb structure.

4.10 Datum 10

Jula: *Waa kelenkayninga a ma se*

English: 5000 naira is good, but it isn't worth the price of the shoes.

Jula structure: *waakelen* – 5000 naira, *kayninga* – is okay/good and *a ma se* – but it is not worth (or doesn't match the value).

English Components: 5000 naira is good – present tense, simple aspect and “it doesn't worth the price”– present tense with negation.

Analysis

In *Jula*, expressions of value or worth rely on particles and contextual interpretation rather than overt inflection. For example, *yni* (“to be good”) and *se* (“to be worth”) are used in their base forms, with tense implied through structure and context rather than explicit marking. Negation is handled syntactically with a *ma se* (“it is not worth”), where *ma* precedes the verb to negate it. English, by contrast, makes tense and negation explicit through auxiliaries: *is* marks present tense, while *doesn’t* or *isn’t* provides negation.

Aspects in both languages are simple because there are neither progressive nor perfect since the focus is on static evaluation rather than ongoing or completed action. *Jula*’s reliance on particle order and contextual cues reflects its analytic nature, while English uses auxiliaries and verb forms to mark tense and aspect more rigidly. Structurally, *Jula* conveys worth or value through *se*, while English idiomatically uses “to be worth” or “to cost.” The colloquial “doesn’t worth” is non-standard in English, with the proper construction being “isn’t worth.” *Jula* achieves meaning through minimal morphological change and contextual inference, while English relies on explicit grammatical markers to ensure clarity.

4.11 Datum 11

Jula: *Hali nneyeret’asoro o ra*

English: Even I don’t buy them at this price

Jula Components: *hali* – even, *nne* – I, *yeret’asoro o ra* – don’t buy them at this price, *yere* – self emphatic marker, *t’a* – I + negation (shortened from *te a*, “not I”), *soro* – buy and *o ra* – at this price.

English Components: even I – emphasis, don’t buy them – present tense, negative - at this price – prepositional phrase (time/place/cost)

Analysis

In *Jula*, negation and emphasis are expressed through particles and clitics rather than auxiliary verbs. For instance, *t’a soro* means “I do not buy,” where *t’a* combines the negation particle *te* with the subject marker, and *soro* remains in its base form (“to buy”). The emphatic *nneyere* adds focus, meaning “even I myself,” which parallels English’s use of even I for subject emphasis. English, by contrast, marks tense and negation explicitly with

auxiliaries: don't buy uses do in the present tense plus not for negation, followed by the bare infinitive buy. Aspects in both languages are simple because they indicate a general or habitual truth rather than an ongoing or completed action. Julia relies on particle placement and context to convey tense and aspect, while English uses auxiliary verbs like do to make these grammatical features explicit. Structurally, Julia's negation is preverbal (*ma* or *te* before the verb), whereas English places negation within the auxiliary (do not).

4.12 Datum 12

Julia: *Ni sonnawaakelenna, n bena samara deenfila san*

English: If you accept 5000 naira, I will buy two pairs of shoes

Julia Components: *Ni sonna* – if you accept, *waakelenna* – 5000 naira (you take/accept it). *n bena* – I will (future marker *ben*) and *samara deenfila san* – buy two pairs of shoes

English Components: If you accept 5000 naira– conditional clause, present tense, I will buy (future simple tense) and two pairs of shoes (object noun phrase).

Analysis

[In Julia, conditional expressions like *ni sonna ... na, n bena san* ("if you accept, I will buy") closely mirror the logic of English first conditionals. The particle *ni* functions as the conditional clause marker, equivalent to English *if*. Present tense is implied in the subordinate clause (*sonna ... na* = accept now), while the main clause uses *ben* as a future marker, signaling intention (*n bena san* = I will buy). English follows a similar pattern with *if* + present simple (*if you accept*) and *will* + verb (*I will buy*). Aspects in both languages are simple with no progressive or perfect marking. These are one-time, specific actions rather than ongoing or completed events. Modality and conditionality are expressed structurally: Julia uses particles like *ben* to mark future intention, while English uses the modal *will*. Verb construction also aligns: Julia keeps *san* ("buy") in its base form after *ben*, while English requires *will* + base verb (*buy*).

4.13 Datum 13

Jula: *Ni samara deenfila lo, nne be se kafeere I ma waakelennikeme woo wooro*

English: If it is for two pairs, I can sell each for 8000 naira

Jula: *Ni samara deenfila lo* – if (it is) two pairs of shoes, *nne be se* – I am able / I can, *kafeere I ma waakelennikeme* – to sell each one for 8000 naira and *woo wooro* – (emphasis/affirmation particle)

English: If it is for two pairs – conditional clause (present tense) and I can sell each for 8000 naira – main clause (modal ability + verb)

Analysis

In Jula, conditional and modal expressions like *ni ... lo, be se kafeere* (“if it is two pairs, I can sell”) show how particles and context carry the weight of tense and modality. The particle *ni* functions as the conditional marker, just like English *if*. Present tense is implied through *lo* (a copula meaning “it is”), while ability or permission is expressed with *be se* (“I can”). The verb *kafeere* (“to sell”) remains in its base form, uninflected for tense or aspect. English parallels this structure with *if* + present tense (*if it is two pairs*) and a modal verb + base verb (*can sell*). Tense is explicitly marked by the copula *is* and the modal *can*, whereas Jula relies on particles and context to signal the same meanings. Aspects in both languages are simple because there is no progressive or perfect marking since the action is hypothetical or conditional rather than ongoing or completed.

5.0 Discussion of Findings

The research investigated the similarities and differences in the use of tense and aspect in Jula and English languages respectively. It explored how both languages express time and the nature of actions using grammatical structures and identified areas of overlap and divergence between the two languages.

5.1 Tense and Aspect Systems in Jula and English Languages

The study revealed key contrasts and overlaps between the tense and aspect systems of Jula and English. English marks tense morphologically past. Tense is grammatically encoded and obligatory. Jula does not inflect verbs for tense. Instead, it uses preverbal particles (e.g., *ka, be, ye*) or relies on context and

adverbials to indicate time. This makes tense more contextual than grammatical. English employs both progressive (is walking), perfect (has walked), and perfect progressive (has been walking) aspects through auxiliaries and verb forms. Jula conveys aspect primarily through particles and word order. For example, *ka* can signal progressive aspect (e.g., *I kataa* = I am going), while *ye* may signal a completed action. The tense and aspect systems of Jula are analytical and context-driven, while English is synthetic and rule-governed, creating key implications for language teaching, translation, and bilingual communication.

5.2 Similarities and Differences in the Way Tense and Aspect Are Expressed in Jula and English

The contrastive analysis between Jula and English revealed both similarities and major differences in the expression of tense and aspect. Both languages use temporal adverbials (e.g., yesterday, tomorrow, now) to indicate time reference. This shared reliance supports interpretation of meaning even when grammatical markers differ. Both Jula and English distinguish between completed and ongoing actions. These forms show a shared ability to express aspects, though they use different mechanisms. English uses inflectional morphology while Jula uses preverbal particles (e.g., *ka*, *be*, *ye*) without changing verb forms. In English, tense is obligatorily encoded in verb structure. In Jula, tense is often inferred from context; the same verb form can cover multiple tenses depending on the situation and particles used.

While both languages aim to express time and action states, English is morphosyntactic and rule-bound, while Jula is analytic and context-sensitive. These findings are crucial for bilingual learners, translators, and linguists working on cross-linguistic structures.

5.3 The Implications of Tense and Aspect Differences between Jula and English for Second Language Acquisition and Translation

Jula speakers learning English may omit tense inflections because Jula relies on context or particles, not verb conjugation. This causes negative transfer in SLA. Learners might overuse present tense forms due to limited verb changes in Jula. English learners may struggle with perfect and progressive aspects (“has been working”, “was working”), which have no exact equivalents in Jula. This affects comprehension and accurate usage. English future and

conditional forms use modals like “will”, “shall”, “might”. These have no direct equivalent in Jula, making them hard to master for native Jula speakers.

Due to Jula’s context-dependent tense system, certain temporal distinctions in English (e.g., “had gone” vs. “went”) may be lost or flattened in translation into Jula. Translators from English to Jula must often add contextual clues (like time adverbials) to preserve meaning since Jula verbs lack tense inflection. When translating Jula to English, ambiguity in tense can result in multiple possible translations. The translator must interpret the *intended time reference* based on discourse.

6.0 Conclusion

This study has explored the tense and aspectual systems of the Jula and English languages, revealing significant structural and functional differences. English, as a morphologically rich language, encodes tense and aspect primarily through verb inflections and auxiliary constructions. In contrast, Jula relies more on context, time adverbials and particles to convey temporal and aspectual meanings, often resulting in non-conjugated verbs with flexible temporal reference. The findings demonstrated that while both languages aim to situate actions in time, their methods of doing so vary greatly. These variations have clear implications for second language acquisition, especially for native Jula speakers learning English. Learners may struggle with English’s complex verb forms and aspectual distinctions due to the absence of equivalent structures in Jula. Similarly, translation between both languages demands a nuanced understanding of how time and action are communicated differently.

7.0 References

- Bouayad, P. (2019). *Contrastive analysis: Definition, aims, and procedures*. University Hassan II.
- Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Djiguimkoudre, N. (2020). “A historical development of contrastive analysis: A relevant review in second and foreign language teaching.” *International Journal of Education*, 8(4), 81–96.

- Erzin, S. (2026). "Contrastive analysis hypothesis: A systematic review of its development in research and practice." *Journal of Language, Literature, Social and Cultural Studies*, 4(2).
- Mashaqba, B. (2021). The roots of philosophy of Chomsky's transformational-generative theory. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 123–135
- National Open University of Nigeria. (2022). ENG 812: Contrastive linguistics. Abuja: NOUN.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Roberts, I. (Ed.). (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Universal Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
- Touqir, S., Nasir, T., & Pervez, S. (2022). "Chomsky's Contribution to Linguistics: A Review." *International Journal of Linguistics and Culture*, 3(1), 205–225.