

УДК: 81'243(497.11)  
378.147::811.111(497.11)  
811.111'367

ИД: 188026380

Примљено: 9. септембра 2011.  
Прихваћено: 25. новембра 2011.  
Оригинални научни рад

ПРОФ. ДР ЈОВАНА В. ДИМИТРИЈЕВИЋ САВИЋ<sup>1</sup>

Универзитет у Крагујевцу, ФИЛУМ,  
Одељење за енглески језик и књижевност

ЈЕЛЕНА ДАНИЛОВИЋ, *сарадник у настави*

Универзитет у Крагујевцу, ФИЛУМ,  
Одељење за енглески језик и књижевност

## DERIVATIONAL MORPHOLOGY AND SERBIAN EFL LEARNERS: THREE PERSPECTIVES ON THE ACQUISITION PROCESS<sup>2</sup>

*Abstract:* Although it has long been an under-researched topic in the field of applied linguistics, morphological knowledge is nowadays regarded as a key component of vocabulary acquisition. The past two decades have witnessed a proliferation of studies of both L1 and L2 learning contexts which shed light on various issues, ranging from morphological processing to receptive/productive knowledge of derivational and inflectional morphology. However, investigations into the acquisition of English morphology by Serbian EFL learners have, to our knowledge, been scarce. The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to explore the productive derivational knowledge of upper-intermediate Serbian EFL learners by means of three different instruments: a test focusing on the knowledge of the

---

<sup>1</sup>j.dimitrijevic.savic@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>This paper was written as part of the project 178014 funded by the Ministry of Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

four main word family members (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs), a test of cognate and non-cognate derivatives employing six cognate English-Serbian suffixes (-ous/-oz(a)n, -ize/-izovati, -ation/-acija -ism/-iz(a)m, -ist/-ist(a), -ity/-itet) and a contextualized word-formation skill test. A combination of a qualitative and quantitative approach to data analysis has revealed the difficulties Serbian EFL learners have been experiencing in their morphology/vocabulary classes and it has enabled us to identify common mistakes and weak spots. Our results have pedagogical implications and could be put to use in curriculum design and methodology.

*Key Words:* word formation, derivational affixes, productive knowledge, derivatives, cognates.

## INTRODUCTION: VOCABULARY KNOWLEDGE, WORD-FORMATION AND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

The complex nature of vocabulary knowledge is often discussed in the pertinent SLA literature in terms of breadth (how many words are known) and depth (how well the words are known). In this regard, the latter encompasses morphological knowledge as well (Richards 1976; Nation 2001), that is, the knowledge of two morphological processes: inflection and word-formation. Generally speaking, inflection deals with the various forms which lexemes exhibit depending on their grammatical context, whereas word-formation deals with the formation of new lexemes by means of derivation or compounding. Distinct characteristics of inflectional and derivational paradigms concerning productivity, semantic opacity, syntactic relevance, etc. (Plag 2003) seem to have resulted in their presenting different learning burdens for learners. Not surprisingly, native speakers commonly master inflections before derivations (Berko 1958), as inflections are always suffixes and do not change the part of speech in word-building, while derivations include both prefixes and suffixes which frequently change the part of speech of the base word (e.g. critic-criticize, solemn-solemnity) or its meaning (e.g. care-careless, militarize-demilitarize).

Central to the issue of word knowledge is the concept of word families, that is, base words and their inflections and derivatives which share a common meaning, e.g. *develop, development, developer, developed, developing* are all members of the same word family and can therefore be counted as one word for the purpose of estimating the number of words a learner knows (Nation and Waring 1997) or calculating the vocabulary size needed for a reader's comprehension of a text. In relation to this, Bauer and Nation (1993, 253) assert that "the important principle behind the idea of a word family is that once the base word or even a derived word is known, the recognition of other members of the family requires little or no extra effort", a view supported by some researchers (Tyler and Nagy 1989; Taft 1994). Nevertheless, while this facilitative effect seems plausible when the receptive dimension of word knowledge is in question (e.g. knowing *abandon* can facilitate

the recognition of *abandonment* in a written text), it is questionable for the productive one as “production involves a higher level of knowledge than reception does” (Read 2000, 26). Studies in L1 acquisition have shown that children’s vocabulary begins to grow rapidly from the fourth grade through high school, which can be ascribed to incidental vocabulary acquisition and the knowledge of affixed words (Nagy and Herman 1987). Interestingly enough, productive knowledge of word family members has been tested on UCLES FCE, CAE and CPE exams for years now as a grammar component (Hughes 1989) even though “teaching word-formation rules has not had a high priority in recent approaches to vocabulary pedagogy” (McCarthy 2001, 64). Nowadays, however, Nation (2005) maintains that teaching high frequency affixes is one of the best ideas for teaching vocabulary and the following section of the paper will illustrate the greater emphasis which has been placed on the role of morphological knowledge in EFL/ESL vocabulary acquisition.

## **A SPARKED INTEREST IN L2 MORPHOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**

Despite the fact that morphology has not received much attention as a branch of applied linguistics in the post-Chomskian era (McCarthy 2001), the past two decades have seen a sparked interest in L1 morphological learning/processing under laboratory conditions as well as in L2 morphological awareness, receptive/productive knowledge of derivational morphology and its interrelatedness with vocabulary knowledge. Schmitt’s (1998) longitudinal study investigated the derivational knowledge of three postgraduate students in the UK and found it incomplete, especially as regards adjective and adverb forms. Similarly, Schmitt (1999) examined the derivative knowledge of undergraduate-bound international students taking the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and reached the conclusion that derivatives for the four main word classes (noun, verb, adjective, adverb) were produced solely in 12 out of 180 cases. On the same note, Schmitt and Zimmerman (2002) focused on learners’ ability to produce derivative forms of a word family in contextualized sentences and determined that full mastery of the word family members tended to be problematic for L2 English learners, recommending the introduction of derivative forms alongside new words in vocabulary teaching, instruction in English affixes, a greater emphasis on adjectives/adverbs and more reading input. The first to explore the correlation between learners’ vocabulary size and their productive knowledge of suffixes were Schmitt and Meara (1997), followed by Mochizuki and Aizawa (2000) who provided insight into a possible affix acquisition order in the Japanese EFL context, concluding that five factors played a significant role in the development of L2 affix knowledge: loan words, instruction, frequency of affixes, frequency of words that contain a partic-

ular affix, and the polyfunctional nature of affixes. On the other hand, Chuenjundaeng (2006) explored receptive knowledge of four English suffixes (-ment, -tion, -er, -ity) among university students, inferring that it was insufficient and that the students were unaware of useful vocabulary learning strategies. Furthermore, Nurhemida (2007) investigated the relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary knowledge, suggesting that morphological knowledge represented a powerful vocabulary-building tool, whereas Nakayama's (2008) empirical study showed that intentional teaching of prefixes boosted short-term retention of vocabulary items. Finally, Ward and Chuenjundaeng (2009) elaborated on learners' knowledge of word-building techniques while Hayashi and Murphy (2011) sought to demonstrate correlations between morphological awareness and vocabulary size in two groups of respondents: native speakers of English versus Japanese ESL learners.

To the best of our knowledge, no studies have so far described in detail the difficulties L2 learners at a certain proficiency level face when dealing with English derivational morphology by testing them on various tasks. This paper is an attempt to fill this void and will, hopefully, contribute to our growing understanding of L2 morphological knowledge and its acquisition in the Serbian EFL context.

### THREE STUDIES: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The first study (Dimitrijević Savić and Danilović 2010) examining the productive derivational knowledge of Serbian EFL learners – freshmen majoring in English at the Faculty of Philology and Arts in Kragujevac – was conducted in a manner consistent with Schmitt and Zimmerman's (2002) work in this area. We made use of a part of their instrument consisting of 16 prompt words and a series of four similar contextualized sentences which were to be filled out with appropriate word forms: adjectives, nouns, verbs and adverbs, e.g.

*traditional* (prompt word)

*noun*     *The celebration of Thanksgiving is an American \_\_\_\_\_.*

*verb*     *Americans \_\_\_\_\_ Thanksgiving.*

*adjective* *Thanksgiving is a \_\_\_\_\_ American holiday.*

*adverb* *Thanksgiving is \_\_\_\_\_ celebrated in American families.*

The aim of this study was to establish which of the four word classes Serbian EFL learners were most likely to know to the degree of mastery, to define the extent of their productive knowledge of the word class members and to shed light on the potential facilitative effect pertinent to learners' productive knowledge of the derivative forms.

Statistical analyses revealed that the learners were able to provide 62.7% of the 64 derivatives and that they managed to produce all four derivatives solely in

5.9% of all cases. Of the four word classes noun derivatives were the best known (71.5% of the correct answers), followed by adjective derivatives (63.3%), verb derivatives (60.7%) and adverb derivatives (55.3%). Furthermore, the chi-square statistic test showed tentative evidence of a facilitative effect of productive knowledge operating across certain word classes, namely, when:

- noun derivatives and adjective derivatives, chi-square (1,  $N = 77$ ) = 9.999,  $p < .005$ ;
- verb derivatives and adjective derivatives, chi-square (1,  $N = 77$ ) = 43.616,  $p < .001$ ;
- verb derivatives and adverb derivatives, chi-square (1,  $N = 77$ ) = 55.721,  $p < .001$ , and
- adjective derivatives and adverb derivatives were compared, chi-square (1,  $N = 77$ ) = 233.252,  $p < .001$ .

The results of our investigation into Serbian EFL learners' productive derivational knowledge of the four lexical classes indicate that noun derivatives are the best known and adverb derivatives the least known, while no significant difference was obtained for productive knowledge of verb derivatives and adjective derivatives. A facilitative effect was, further, revealed for knowledge of some, but not all derivative classes in a word family. A strong facilitative effect was observed in terms of the productive derivational knowledge of noun derivatives and adjective derivatives, verb derivatives and adjective derivatives, verb derivatives and adverb derivatives, and adjective derivatives and adverb derivatives. The results did not support a facilitative effect for knowledge of noun derivatives and adverb derivatives, nor of noun derivatives and verb derivatives.

Considering that the Serbian EFL learners in our study produced 62.7% of the possible 64 derivatives, that is, on average, fewer than three of the four possible derivatives for a given word family and as full mastery of a word family (all four derivatives) was observed in a very small percentage of cases (5.9%), we must conclude that the strong version of the facilitative effect among word family members is not supported by the results of our study. Learners who knew one member of a word family did not demonstrate productive knowledge of all of the other word forms. However, as nearly two thirds of derivatives were produced, some degree of facilitation, possibly only between some classes of derivatives, may have been in effect.

The results of this study do clearly indicate that the acquisition of derivational knowledge, an incremental process as in the case with (most) other forms of lexical knowledge, is likely to be influenced by relationships within word families. For example, as previously mentioned, no facilitative effect was revealed between learners' productive knowledge of nouns and adverbs, or of nouns and verbs. In the case of nouns and adverbs, once relations between derivational classes are con-

sidered (multiple affixation first and foremost), a (strong) facilitative effect should, perhaps, not be expected at all. On the other hand, multiple affixation cannot be a factor which can easily explain the lack of observed facilitation between nouns and verbs as nominal bases are quite common with the more productive verb-forming suffixes in English. An explanation which suggests itself is that Serbian EFL learners require additional instruction in the morphological formal regularity of English derivational suffixes. Furthermore, the findings clearly indicate that the productive mastery of word family members is no easy task for Serbian EFL learners, and underscore the view that adverb forms (Schmitt and Zimmerman 2002) are least likely to be known.

The second study (Danilović 2010) was designed in accordance with Nation's (2001) productive measure of affix elicitation, that is, a test which required the participants, freshmen majoring in English at the Faculty of Philology and Arts in Kragujevac, to fill in 60 blanks in a large sample of sentences by producing appropriate suffixed forms, relying on the prompt words provided in brackets, e.g.

*I really must \_\_\_\_\_ (v. APOLOGY) for bothering you with this.*

*They resisted our attempts to \_\_\_\_\_ (v. MODERN) the society by reintroducing the rule of monarchs in Serbia.*

*He had always wanted an \_\_\_\_\_ (adj. ADVENTURE) life in the tropics.*

*She's \_\_\_\_\_ (adj. NERVE) about something, in case you didn't notice.*

Its purpose was to explore the possible facilitative effect of English-Serbian cognate lexemes/suffixes on the productive derivational knowledge of Serbian EFL learners (e.g. *apologize* = non-cognate vs. *modernize* = cognate, Ser. *modernizovati*; *adventurous* = non-cognate vs. *nervous* = cognate, Ser. *nervozan*) based on the assumption that morphological transfer is just as probable as any other kind of transfer (Odlin 1989); "the existence of general lexical similarities is probably a major influence on how much transfer of bound morphemes will take place" (Ibid., 82). Additionally, Mochizuki and Aizawa (2000) maintain that knowledge of loan words is part of a learner's L1 competence and seems to transfer to his/her L2 knowledge. However, while it stood to reason to hypothesize that the existence of cognate lexemes/suffixes in English and Serbian (Klajn 2003) would result in learners' improved performance on the targeted cognate derivatives, the results obtained by means of a statistical data analysis (SPSS 17.0) proved that there was only a slight difference in scores (most notably for the suffix *-ism*) but that cognate derivatives were not better known than non-cognate ones in all cases – on the contrary, they were less known in two instances (suffixes *-ist* and *-ity*).

SUFFIX	MINIMUM		MAXIMUM		MEAN		STANDARD DEVIATION	
	C	NON	C	NON	C	NON	C	NON
<b>-OUS</b>	2	1	5	5	4.73	4.26	.53	.94
<b>-IZE</b>	3	3	5	5	4.86	4.69	.42	.49
<b>-ATION</b>	4	3	5	5	4.70	4.77	.46	.48
<b>-ISM</b>	0	0	5	5	4.78	2.41	.76	.86
<b>-IST</b>	2	3	5	5	4.01	4.86	.39	.38
<b>-ITY</b>	1	3	5	5	4.22	4.77	.98	.45

Table 1: Knowledge of cognate (C) and non-cognate (NON) derivatives

This, in turn, suggests that Serbian learners may not be making the most of their L1 knowledge in the process of English L2 acquisition which could be related to the fact that English and Serbian are not closely related languages so, perhaps, learners do not expect to come across morphological similarities between L1 and L2, and consequently do not recognize word forms which share a common background and contain cognate suffixes. As there is no way of knowing whether students were simply not familiar with certain derivatives in English, although all the test items were excerpted from word formation sections of B2 CEFR textbooks, and therefore achieved better results with some affixes (those ending in *-ist* and *-ity* in the non-cognate category, for example) than others, further research focusing specifically on cognate and non-cognate lexemes could provide more conclusive evidence about students' reliance on L1 and its role in the productive vocabulary tasks in L2. Needless to say, the learners' L1 knowledge, which we took for granted for the purpose of this study, could be brought into question and deserves more attention as well. On the other hand, as pertinent studies indicate (Šipka 2006; Ćorić 2008) that the usage of foreign or 'international' suffixes (e.g. *-ation*, *-ist*, *-ism*), is on the rise in Serbian as a result of internationalization and globalization, instruction regarding these issues might facilitate the acquisition of numerous English words for the Serbian EFL learners.

The third study was, in effect, a quantitative analysis of the data gathered by means of two word-formation tests which the first-year students majoring in English at the Faculty of Philology and Arts in Kragujevac did at the end of their first and second semester of study. The tests were modeled on word-formation sections which can be found in UCLES FCE examinations (B2 CEFR) – we chose two short authentic English texts and deleted 10 words (nouns, adjectives, adverbs, verbs), offering the clues for the missing items in brackets e.g.

History will long remember (1) \_\_\_\_\_ (ADMIRATION) Nelson Mandela for leading South Africa, (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (HERO), from hateful apartheid to free (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (DEMOCRACY) majority rule, marvel at his commitment to honesty and healing and celebrate his promotion of this country as a (4) \_\_\_\_\_ (DIVERSITY) and (5) \_\_\_\_\_ (TOLERATE) "rainbow nation".

(Adapted from the New York Times)

The results of these two tests showed that even though the learners had spent the whole academic year in an exposure-rich<sup>3</sup> environment, their productive derivational knowledge was far from complete as they provided approximately 50% of the correct derivative forms on each test. What is more, the missing items were, purposefully, the word forms familiar to students – they had encountered them in the texts/exercises introduced in their vocabulary and text analysis classes. This did not, however, have a bearing on the results as students made a number of word class/spelling mistakes both on the first and the second test, and could be taken as an indication that receptive knowledge of word forms does not necessarily imply their productive knowledge as well. Therefore, future research on explicit teaching of word families/affixes and its short/long-term effects could yield valuable insights into this matter, contributing to a more effective classroom practice and L2 learners' improved results on word-formation tests.

Finally, taking into consideration the data collected from all three studies, we have been able to pinpoint the following common mistakes and weak spots:

- **nominal suffixes:** -ance/-ence, -ant/-ent (e.g. \**correspondance*)
- **adjectival suffixes:** -able/-ible, -ic/-ical, -ant/-ent (e.g. \**irresistable*, \**psychologic*, \**obediant*)
- **adverbial suffix:** -ly/-ally (e.g. \**legaly*, \**heroicly*)
- **nominal compounds of the NOUN + NOUN type** (e.g. *retirement age*)
- **confusable derivatives:** *tolerant* – *tolerable*, *unqualified* – *disqualified*, *economic* – *economical*
- **the choice of a suitable negative prefix/suffix:** dis-/un-/in-/im-/il-/ir-/less (e.g. \**unattentive*, \**inpure*, \**unpleased*, \**illoyal*, /\**uncareful*)
- **problems with spelling** (e.g. \**strenght*, \**playfull*, \**readyness*, \**mercylless*, \**incourage*, \**psichiatric*, \**persuation*, \**minimalizm*)

While the problem with the production of nominal compounds of the NOUN + NOUN type is understandable as it can be attributed to the fact that nominal compounds in Serbian are structurally different, it is noticeable that many of the afore-

<sup>3</sup> Exposure-rich environment in this context refers to at least 20 classes consisting of lectures and practice in English which students received each week in both their first and second semester of study.



mentioned difficulties our upper-intermediate EFL learners encountered are inextricably linked to their poor spelling performance. Even though they have all experienced years of studying English, many are still baffled by the orthographic representation of the sounds of English and obviously need guidance and practice in order to become proficient spellers. Further, instruction could be particularly useful in the case of confusable derivatives or 'synforms' (Laufer 1988) – similar lexical forms which are likely to cause confusion in L2 learners of English.

## CONCLUSION

An important ramification of the increasing number of studies which have explored teaching and learning vocabulary in a second language is that an understanding of the direct and systematic study of vocabulary as deserving of a place in the language curriculum is no longer contested. Yet, there is still debate as to which techniques do most to enhance learners' vocabulary knowledge. A more complete understanding of vocabulary learning in contexts which involve many and varied opportunities for intentional and incidental vocabulary learning, as well as explicit teaching of word formation in English, would present a significant contribution to the development of a comprehensive approach to second language vocabulary teaching and learning.

As far as Serbian EFL teaching/learning context is concerned, the results of our studies indicate that upper-intermediate EFL learners' productive derivational knowledge is incomplete and that learners do not seem to be taking full advantage of their L1 knowledge in L2 acquisition. Spending time in an exposure-rich environment of English language and literature program at the Faculty of Philology and Arts in Kragujevac alone was not enough for the productive mastery of derivative forms to develop. These findings are in line with other explorations (Schmitt 1998; Schmitt and Zimmerman 2002) and underscore the view that the acquisition of derivational morphology in EFL/ESL learning contexts is not relatively automatic. On the contrary, it obviously deserves a more prominent place in curriculum design and methodology.

## SUMMARY

Knowledge of derivational morphology is today considered to be a key component of vocabulary learning in second language acquisition. Consequently, there has been a constant rise in the number of studies which have concerned themselves with morphological processing, the receptive and productive dimensions of the knowledge of derivational morphology and related topics in a wide variety of teaching and learning contexts. At this time, however, there is also a notable gap in the research literature where the acquisition of English derivational morphology

by Serbian EFL learners is concerned. This paper aims to contribute to this important area of research in second language acquisition through a synthesis of the results of three studies which have taken different perspectives on the acquisition of English derivational morphology by Serbian EFL learners, students at the Faculty of Philology and Arts in Kragujevac. The first focuses on learners' knowledge of word family members belonging to different lexical word classes, the second on learners' productive knowledge of cognates and their potential facilitative effect in vocabulary learning, the third on productive knowledge of word-formation in English. The results which emerge from a combined quantitative and qualitative research methodology clearly delineate some of the most pronounced difficulties faced by Serbian EFL learners in the process of acquiring knowledge of English derivational morphology and, therefore, have clear pedagogical implications for English language teaching in Serbia and beyond.

The results of the study which investigated productive knowledge of word family members indicate that nouns are the best known and adverbs the least known lexical word class, while learners' productive knowledge of adjectives and verbs appears to be on a par. It is interesting to note that results point to a strong facilitative effect between productive knowledge of nouns and adjectives from the same word family, verbs and adjectives, verbs and adverbs, adjectives and adverbs, but not nouns and adverbs nor nouns and verbs. However, as the learners who took part in the research exhibited productive knowledge in only 62.7% of the target derivatives, we are led to conclude that the results of this study do not support a strong version of the facilitative effect among all members of a word family. In other words, these results underscore that learners' productive knowledge of one member of a word family should not be taken as indication of their knowledge of any remaining members, a finding with clear implications for English language teaching, most specifically, vocabulary teaching.

The goal of the second study discussed in this paper was to investigate the role of cognates in the acquisition of productive knowledge of English derivational morphology. The study focused on learners' productive knowledge of English words derived using suffixes which have cognates in Serbian (*-ous/-oz(a)n*, *-ize/-izovati*, *-ation/-acija*, *-ism/-iz(a)m*, *-ist/-ist(a)*, *-ity/-itet*); half of the English words used in the data collection instrument have cognates in Serbian, whereas the rest do not. The results of a quantitative analysis of learner responses, specifically the comparison of learners' productive knowledge of cognates and non-cognates, lead us to conclude that Serbian EFL learners do not make the best use of their L1 knowledge in the process of acquiring English derivational morphology. Namely, the learners who participated in this study did not reveal themselves to possess superior productive knowledge of cognates compared to non-cognates. It is possible that learners do not anticipate similarities between word-formation in English and

in Serbian and are, consequently, unable to recognize them once they encounter them or to use them to their best advantage. Further research is needed into the effects which explicit teaching might have on learners' ability to recognize cognates in English and Serbian and use this knowledge in the process of acquiring English derivational morphology.

The results of the third study of Serbian EFL learners' productive knowledge of English derivational morphology indicate that even after two semesters in an exposure-rich learning environment, learners were only able to produce approximately 50% of the derivative forms targeted by standard testing formats. A qualitative synthesis of the results of this study suggests that upper-intermediate Serbian EFL learners encounter the greatest degree of difficulty with the following: the nominal suffixes *-ance/-ence* and *-ant/-ent*, adjectival suffixes *-able/-ible*, *-ic/-ical*, *-ant/-ent*, adverbial suffixes *-ly/-ally*, nominal compounds of the NOUN + NOUN type, confusable derivatives (e.g. *tolerant – tolerable*, *unqualified – disqualified*, *economic – economical*), choice of appropriate negative prefix and spelling.

In conclusion, the results of research into Serbian EFL learners' productive knowledge of English derivational morphology give us no pause in terms of agreeing with the inferences drawn by other researchers who have delved into issues surrounding vocabulary learning in second language acquisition: the process of acquiring productive knowledge of the derivational morphology of a second or foreign language is not relatively automatic; it is, instead, a process to which more attention needs to be devoted in the teaching and learning process to maximize benefits for learners.

## REFERENCES

- Bauer, Laurie and Nation, Paul. 1993. "Word families". *International Journal of Lexicography* 6(3): 253–275.
- Berko, Jean. 1958. "The child's learning of English morphology". *Word* 14: 150–177.
- Chuenjundaeng, Jitlada. (2006). *An investigation of SUT students' receptive knowledge of English noun suffixes* (Unpublished MA thesis). Suranaree University of Technology.
- Danilović, Jelena. 2010. "Language transfer, cognates and productive derivational knowledge of Serbian EFL learners". *Nasleđe* 15(2): 77–84.
- Dimitrijević Savić, Jovana and Danilović, Jelena. 2010. "The Robustness of the Facilitative Effect in the Productive Derivational Knowledge of L2 Learners of English". *Primenjena lingvistika* 11: 305–315.
- Hayashi, Yuko and Murphy, Victoria. 2011. "An investigation of morphological awareness in Japanese learners of English". *Language learning journal* 39(1): 105–120.
- Hughes, Arthur. 1989. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Klajn, Ivan. 2003. *Tvorba reči u savremenom srpskom jeziku*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.
- Laufer, Batia. 1988. "The concept of 'synforms' (similar lexical forms) in L2 vocabulary acquisition". *Language and Education* 2: 113–132.
- McCarthy, Michael. 2001. *Issues in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mochizuki, Masamichi and Aizawa, Kazumi. 2000. "An affix acquisition order for EFL learners: an exploratory study". *System* 28(2): 291–304.
- Nagy, William and Herman, Patricia. 1987. "Breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: implications for acquisition and instruction", in *The nature of vocabulary acquisition*, M.G. McKeown and M.E. Curtis (eds.), pp. 19–36. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nakayama, Natsue. 2008. "Effects of Vocabulary Learning Using Affix: Special Focus on Prefix". Retrieved from Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College website: <http://www.kyoai.ac.jp/college/ronshuu/no-08/nakayama.pdf>
- Nation, Paul. 2001. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, Paul and Waring, Robert. 1997. "Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists", in *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy*, N. Schmitt and M. McCarthy (eds.), pp. 6–19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nurhemida. 2007. *The Relationship between Morphological Awareness and English Vocabulary Knowledge of Indonesian Senior High School Students* (Unpublished MA thesis). The University of Queensland.
- Odlin, Terence. 1989. *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plag, Ingo. 2003. *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Read, John. 2000. *Assessing Vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack. 1976. "The role of vocabulary teaching". *TESOL Quarterly* 10(1): 77–89.
- Schmitt, Norbert. 1998. "Tracking the incremental acquisition of second language vocabulary: A longitudinal study". *Language Learning* 48: 281–317.
- Schmitt, Norbert. 1999. "The relationship between TOEFL vocabulary items and meaning, association, collocation, and word class knowledge". *Language Testing* 16: 189–216.
- Schmitt, Norbert and Meara, Paul. 1997. "Researching vocabulary through a word knowledge framework: Word association and verbal suffixes". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 7–36.
- Schmitt, Norbert and Zimmerman, Cheryl Boyd. 2002. "Derivative word forms: what do learners know?". *TESOL Quarterly* 36(2): 145–171.
- Taft, Marcus. 1994. "Interactive-activation as a framework for understanding morphological processing", in *Morphological structure, lexical representation and lexical access*, D. Sandra and M. Taft (eds.), pp. 271–294. East Sussex: Erlbaum.
- The New York Times*, Editorial (2008, May 24). The failures of Thabo Mbeki. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/24/opinion/24sat1.html?ref=nelsonmandela>
- Tyler, Andrea and Nagy, William. 1989. "The acquisition of English derivational morphology". *Journal of Memory and Language* 28: 649–667.

- Ward, Jeremy and Chuenjundaeng, Jitlada. 2009. "Suffix knowledge: Acquisition and applications". *System* 37(3): 461–469.
- Šipka, Danko. 2006. *Osnovi leksikologije i srodnih disciplina*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Ćorić, Božo. 2008. *Tvorba imenica u srpskom jeziku*. Beograd: Čigoja štampa.

Јована Димиријевић Савић, Јелена Даниловић

## ДЕРИВАЦИОНА МОРФОЛОГИЈА И УЧЕНИЦИ ЕНГЛЕСКОГ КАО СТРАНОГ ЈЕЗИКА У СРБИЈИ: ПРОЦЕС УСВАЈАЊА ИЗ ТРИ УГЛА

### Резиме

Познавање деривационе морфологије се данас сматра кључним за усвајање вокабулара у настави страног језика, те је и све већи број истраживања која се баве питањима морфолошког процесуирања, рецептивног и продуктивног знања деривационе морфологије и њима сличним у различитим наставним контекстима. У овом тренутку, међутим, недостаје нам истраживања која се конкретно баве усвајањем деривационе морфологије енглеског језика код ученика енглеског као страног којима је српски матерњи језик. Наш рад представља покушај да се да допринос овој важној теми кроз синтезу резултата трију истраживања кроз која је процес усвајања деривационе морфологије енглеског језика при учењу енглеског језика као страног на Филолошко-уметничком факултету у Крагујевцу сагледан из различитих углова: на основу познавања именица, глагола, придева и прилога из истих породица речи, познавања речи у српском и енглеском језику изведених помоћу сродних суфикса и продуктивног знања творбе речи у енглеском језику. Резултати, произашли из комбинације квалитативног и квантитативног приступа обради добијених података, јасно указују на потешкоће са којима се сусрећу ученици енглеског језика као страног којима је српски матерњи језик у процесу усвајања деривационе морфологије енглеског језика, те имају педагошке импликације за наставу енглеског језика као страног у Србији али и шире.

Резултати истраживања у коме смо се бавиле продуктивним знањем речи из одређене деривационе парадигме показују да ученици најбоље познају именице а најслабије прилоге, док је њихово продуктивно знање придева и глагола приближно једнако. Занимљиво је, даље, да резултати указују да постоји јак ефекат фасилитације када је у питању познавање именица и придева из исте деривационе парадигме, глагола и придева, глагола и прилога, придева и прилога, али не и именица и прилога нити именица и глагола. Међутим, обзиром да су ученици у просеку показали продуктивно знање тек у 62,7 процената тражених речи, морамо закључити да резултати овог истраживања не подржавају јаку верзију ефекта фасилитације међу свим члановима одређене деривационе парадигме. Другим речима, наши резултати јасно показују да ако ученик познаје једну од чланица одређене деривационе парадигме, није врло вероватно да познаје и остале, што има јасне импликације за наставу енглеског језика као страног, пре свега за подучавање вокабулара.

Циљ другог истраживања на које дајемо осврт у нашем раду био је да испита улогу сродних речи, то јест, сродних суфикса у процесу усвајања продуктивног знања деривационе морфологије енглеског језика. У истраживању је испитивано продуктивно знање речи енглеског језика изведених помоћу суфикса који имају сродне суфиксе у српском језику (-ous/-оз(а)н, -ize/-изоваиџи, -ation/-аџија, -ism/-из(а)м, -ist/-ист(а), -ity/-иџеџи); неке од речи чије је продуктивно познавање испитивано имале

су сродне речи у српском језику, док друге нису. На основу резултата квантитативног поређења продуктивног знања речи енглеског језика које имају сродне речи у српском и продуктивног знања речи енглеског језика које немају сродне речи у српском можемо закључити да ученици енглеског језика као страног којима је српски матерњи језик не користе на најбољи начин своје знање матерњег језика током процеса усвајања деривационе морфологије енглеског језика. Наиме, испитаници у овом случају нису показали супериорније продуктивно знање енглеских речи које имају сродне речи у српском језику у односу на енглеске речи које немају сродне речи у српском језику. Могуће је да ученици не очекују сличности између српског и енглеског језика на плану деривационе морфологије те поменуте сличности нису у могућности да препознају и искористе на прави начин. Потребно је даље испитати да ли би експлицитно подучавање помогло ученицима да постојање сродних речи у српском и енглеском језику употребе у корист усвајања деривационе морфологије енглеског језика.

Резултати трећег истраживања продуктивног знања деривационе морфологије енглеског језика указују да и након прве године основних студија англистике ученици показују одговарајући степен продуктивног знања деривационе морфологије енглеског језика тек у нешто више од 50 одсто случајева. Квалитативна синтеза резултата сва три истраживања сугерише да ученицима енглеског језика као страног на Б2 нивоу знања у Србији највеће потешкоће представљају именички суфикси *-ance/-ence* и *-ant/-ent*, придевски суфикси *-able/-ible*, *-ic/-ical*, *-ant/-ent*, прилошки суфикси *-ly/-ally*, сложенице типа ИМЕНИЦА + ИМЕНИЦА, изведенице које припадају истој породици речи али имају веома различита значења (на пример, *tolerant – tolerable, unqualified – disqualified, economic – economical*), избор одговарајућег префикса са негативним значењем и проблеми са тачном графемском репрезентацијом лексема (*spelling*).

На основу свега наведеног закључујемо да се можемо сложити са тврдњом других истраживача ове проблематике да усвајање деривационе морфологије енглеског језика при учењу енглеског језика као страног није аутоматски процес, већ је процес коме је, како би се ученици у њега што успешније укључили, потребно посветити више пажње у настави.

*Кључне речи:* деривациона морфологија, деривациони афикси, продуктивно знање, изведенице, сродне речи.