On the Acquisition of Derivational Suffixes by Kuwaiti EFL Learners

Maye A. Alotaibi
English Lecturer at PAAET & CBS, Kuwait
Abdullah M. Alotaibi
Associate Prof at PAAET & CBE, Kuwait

Abstract
        This study aims to test the extent to which 90 Kuwaiti EFL learners are aware of the correct use of derivational suffixes in English. It also identifies the mains reasons of the errors that Kuwaiti EFL learners may make. In addition, it investigates whether the English proficiency level of the participants plays a role in their answers on the test. To this end, the participants were tested twice in this study; a multiple-choice test was used to check their comprehension skills, whereas a fill-in the blank test was used to measure their ability to produce the correct derivational suffixes in English. Following data analysis, the results reveal that Kuwaiti EFL learners are fairly aware of the correct use of English derivational suffixes to a certain degree; the total mean on both tests (comprehension = 70% and production = 56%) is 63%. The participants obtained higher percentage of correct answers on the comprehension test (mean= 70%) compared to the production test (mean = 56%). Additionally, the t-test shows that the participants' English proficiency level plays a central role in their comprehension and production of these suffixes. The performance of the Advanced Learners (ALs) (comprehension = 77% and production = 62%) is better than that of the Intermediate Learners (ILs) (comprehension = 64% and production = 48%) on the tests. In particular, there is a statistically significant difference between the answers of ALs and ILs on both tests. Regarding the types of error made by the participants, I argued that the most noticeable ones are due to: (1) the modification that non-neutral derivational suffixes cause when they are attached to the word (stems/roots); and (2) first language (L1) influence. Finally, the study concludes with some recommendations for further research.

Keywords: English derivational morphology, derivational suffixes, Second Language Acquisition (SLA), Arabic, L1 influence, Kuwaiti EFL learners

Introduction

There has been a wide debate on the ability of EFL learners to acquire an aspect of L2 morphology, namely, derivational affixes (Tyler & Nagy, 1989; Jia, 2006; Silva & Clahsen, 2008). Linguists have been debating as whether Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is more constrained by the phonological or morphosyntactic attributes of first language (L1). Following this line of inquiry, this study aims to shed light on this issue by investigating whether Kuwaiti EFL learners are able to use derivational suffixes in English correctly. There are few studies which have investigated the acquisition of derivational morphemes in English by Arabic-speaking EFL learners, especially studies that examine the difference between the learners' comprehension and production abilities to use these suffixes correctly. It seems that this field still requires further research, and the current study aims to bridge this gap. Particularly, this study investigates the possible causes of correct/wrong answers the participants may provide on the tests. Additionally, this study aims to determine whether the English proficiency level of the participants plays a role in the comprehension and production of derivational suffixes. The ultimate goal is to examine whether the learners' comprehension skills of the correct use of derivational suffixes are better than their production skills or vice versa.

Literature review
Derivational morphemes in English

Before reviewing the literature review, it is necessary to define the word *morpheme*, especially since linguists suggested slightly different definitions of the term. For instance, a morpheme is defined as the smallest meaningful unit of a language (Boey, 1975, p. 37). Another definition is proposed by Tomori (1977, p. 16), who defines a morpheme as the minimal linguistic element that carries grammatical and/or semantic meaning, and it cannot be divided into smaller grammatical components. Later, Bauer (1983, p.14) states that a morpheme is the minimal unit of grammatical analysis. One last definition is suggested by Farinde & Ojo (2000), who indicate that a morpheme, in English, is the smallest meaningful grammatical unit.

An examination of the above demonstrates that morpheme, in general, may have a lexical meaning and/or grammatical function. The morphemes with grammatical meanings, which are limited in English, are inflectional morphemes. Inflectional morphemes do not change the word class and/or the meanings of the words to which they are attached, as in the following examples:

1)   the plural –*s*   e.g. dog/dogs
2)   the possessive – '*s*   e.g. the girl's toy
3)   the past tense –*d*   e.g. play/played

However, derivational affixes modify the meaning and sometimes the word class to which they are attached. Many morphemes of this type make an appearance in English. Note that when both inflectional and derivational morphemes are attached to the same word, the derivational ones are always closer to the root, at least, in English (Altakhaineh, 2014, p. 32). This is illustrated in the following examples:

4)   create + ion → creation (one derivational morpheme)

5)   journal + ist + s → journalists (one derivational and then one inflectional)

6)   real+ ize + ed → realized (one derivational and then one inflectional)

In English, derivational bound morphemes or affixes can be prefixes or suffixes. It is worth pointing out that all prefixes in English are derivational, modifying the meaning of the word. However, prefixes, in English, do not change the syntactic category of the word to which they are attached. For example, the derivational prefixes *re-* in *redo* and *-il* in *illegal* modify the meanings of the previous words *do* and *legal*, but they do not change the syntactic category of the derived words. Both *do* and *redo* are verbs and *legal* and *illegal* are adjectives. In comparison with derivational suffixes, most of them modify both the syntactic category and the meaning of the derived words. A few of them do not modify the syntactic category, such as *–ist* in *journalist* and *-dom* in *kingdom* (Altakhaineh, 2014, p. 28). However, the majority of derivational suffixes do modify the syntactic category, such as noun-forming suffixes in *create* to *creation*, verb-forming suffixes in *ideal* to *idealize*, adjective-forming suffixes in *agree* to *agreeable*, and adverb-forming suffixes in *sudden* to *suddenly*.

All in all, this study investigates only English derivational affixes, which are divided into two types (Kiparsky, 1982):

1.   Neutral affixes: are well known by the fact that they do not modify the phonological shape of the stem to which they are attached. For example, the derivational suffix *-ness* is an instance of a neutral suffix; when this suffix combines with a stem/root word *ill* as in the derived word *illness*, it does not influence the segmental or suprasegmental characteristics of the stem *ill*. Other examples of neutral derivational suffixes are *-dom -ment* and *-er.*

2.   Non-neutral affixes: are those that lead to phonological processes or changes to the base. The derivational suffix *-tion* is an example of a non-neutral suffix, since it significantly alters the phonological form of the stem/root to which it is attached. Specifically, the alveolar stop consonant /d/ is transformed into a post-alveolar fricative /ʒ/ with the addition of the *-ion* suffix in the derived word *erosion* (erode + ion = erosion). It is clear that the change also affects the orthography of the resulted word, in which the letter *d* is replaced by the letter *s,* with the deletion of the letter *e* after *d.* In a similar

vein, the derivational suffix *-ity* alters the primary stress from the first syllable in *popular* to the third syllable in *popularity*, and results in a modification to the syllable structure.

The difference between neutral and non-neutral affixes, in general, and derivational affixes in particular is discussed in this study, since earlier studies on first and second language acquisition show that non-neutral suffixes seem to be more difficult to acquire than neutral suffixes. In this regard, Tyler & Nagy (1989) note that many errors in derivational neutral vs. non-neutral affixes produced by children could be a direct result of overgeneralization in the production or acceptance of words to which the neutral suffixes are attached, such as **spyer*. This could be due to the fact that a child has not reached the conclusion that there are exceptions to some productive rules in English. Therefore, the distinction between the two types of affix is important in the current study, which examines Kuwaiti EFL learners' acquisition of derivational suffixes. The ten derivational suffixes used in the tests are divided equally between neutral and non-neutral suffixes (see Appendix One). The next section provides an overview of the studies that tackled the acquisition of derivational affixes.

Previous studies on acquiring derivational morphemes

As mentioned previously, the debate among linguists has been focused on whether L1 can have an impact on the acquisition of L2 structures. In a recent study, the effect of L1 on L2 learners' responsiveness to morphological details in masked-priming was insignificant as discussed by Silva and Clahsen (2008). Conversely, a significant number of current SLA research studies suggest that L1 could have an influence on the acquisition of L2 structures. For instance, Juffs (1998) examines the impact of L1verb-argument structure on sentence processing by advanced ESL learners. Juffs (1998) indicates that pertinent to L1 backgrounds on grammaticality judgments about causative-anticausative alternation, Romance-languages speakers outperformed their East Asian, e.g. Korean, Japanese and Chinese counterparts. The difference in the performance could be ascribed to the effect of L1, given the fact that the morphosyntactic markings of causativity are required by East Asian languages, whilst this requirement is non-existent in Romance languages. In another study conducted on Chinese and Korean participants, Koda (2000) explains that L1 contextual details, e.g. L1 print processing experience influences L2 morphological processing among Chinese and Korean learners of English as a second language. In particular, Koda shows that the Chinese participants were more successful than their Korean counterparts in combining morphological and contextual information, especially when they process

sentences in L2. This has been attributed to their experience with combining word-internal and contextual information in their L1, i.e. Chinese.

In a related vein, L1 impact on L2 acquisition has been noted by Basnight-Brown *et al.* (2007). In particular, they explain how L1 influence can make the acquisition of morphological aspect of L2 easier, especially among European-languages speakers. For example, in relation to cross-modal lexical decisions on nested stems, Serbian learners of English as a second language exhibited morphological responsiveness, whilst Chinese ESL learners did not (Basnight-Brown *et al.*, 2007). The researchers argue that Serbian or European learners in general, may not be constrained compared to their Chinese counterparts by the age of acquisition, due to the fact that they are more acquainted with an alphabetic script, and they have been exposed to highly inflected languages, as noted by Jia *et al*. (2002) and Jia (2006).

In another recent study, Alotaibi (2016) examines whether 100 Kuwaiti EFL learners have the ability to decide if inflectional morphemes in English are used correctly. The study also investigates the main causes behind the errors made by the participants. The results show that Kuwaiti EFL learners' awareness of the correct use of inflectional morphemes in English is, to a certain degree, adequate (total mean= 65.5%). In addition, the results of the t-test demonstrate that the degree of English proficiency contributed to the participants' answers on the test, so that the advanced learners provided more accurate responses in comparison with their intermediate counterparts. Specifically, the differences between the advanced (73.5%) and intermediate learners (57.5%) were statistically significant. With respect to the types of error detected on the test, Alotaibi suggests that the most observable ones were a result of L1 influence, in addition to the irregular patterns of certain types of inflectional morphemes in English.

Based on the previous literature, it has become apparent that the acquisition of derivational morphemes by Arab EFL learners, in general, and Kuwaiti EFL learners in particular, has received little attention. As a result, this study aims at bridging this gap by investigating the types of error made by Kuwaiti EFL learners as well as exploring to what extent they are aware of the proper use of English derivational suffixes. The ultimate goal of this study is to supply potential answers to some of the most prominent questions in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). The following are the research questions:

1.   Are Kuwaiti EFL learners aware of derivational suffixes in English?
2.   What are the most frequent types of error, if there, they make when they use English derivational suffixes and why?
3.   Are their comprehension and production abilities of English derivational suffixes influenced by their English proficiency level?

On the basis of my observation, the following research hypotheses are formulated: (1) the English proficiency level of the participants plays a role in Kuwaiti EFL learners' comprehension and production of derivational morphemes on the tests; and (2) the degree of modification of non-neutral derivational suffixes has an impact on the correct answers provided by the participants on the tests. That is, the more modifications the type causes, the more errors the participants tend to make.

Methodology
Sample

The sample of the current study consisted of ninety Kuwaiti EFL learners, who were doing their undergraduate degrees at the Public Authority of Applied Education and Training (PAAET). The participants' age ranged between 18 and 26 (mean age = 22). Regarding their sex, which is not an independent variable in this study; the participants were divided into 46 males and 44 females. To validate the results, the participants were randomly chosen out of approximately 8000 learners, without any preference. They were divided into two groups according to their scores on the English Placement Test (EPT): the participants who scored 50-69 on the EPT were considered Intermediate Learners (ILs), whereas those who scored 70 -85 were considered Advanced Learners (ALs). The ninety participants were, then, divided into 50 ILs and 40 ALs. Due to the complexity and unpredictability of English non-neutral derivational suffixes, I chose intermediate and advanced learners to participate in the study. The participants of this study have studied English at schools in Kuwait for twelve years and have already completed two main English courses at the CBE, i.e. E 161 and E 261. These courses deal with many complex morphosyntactic structures in English, such as inflectional and derivational morphemes. With regard to ethical issues, the participants were willing to voluntarily participate in the study. The participants were also informed that they can leave anytime if they feel stressed or uncomfortable. At the end of the test, I thanked the participants for their cooperation and willingness to take part in the study.

Instrument
The test

In order to measure the participants' ability to comprehend and produce derivational suffixes in English properly, two tests were used as elicitation instruments; a multiple-choice test and a fill-in the blank test (see Appendix One). Regarding the multiple-choice test, Nicol (2007, p. 54) points out that a multiple-choice test is commonly used to measure participants' comprehension of a certain structure. Therefore, I opted for the

multiple-choice test to determine whether the participants are aware of derivational suffixes in English. This test has been used by Josiah & Udoudom (2012) and Altakhaineh & Rahrouh (2015) in their studies, eliciting fruitful results. With respect to the fill-in the blank test, it is a commonly-used instrument to test the participants' production skills. The test is also useful to shed light on the causes beyond the errors made by the participants. In the current study, each test included ten sentences, representing different derivational suffixes as shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Types of derivational morpheme on the test

Types of derivational morpheme	Examples of each type
Neutral morphemes	-ness (dark ⟶ darkness) -able (agree ⟶ agreeable) -ment (move ⟶ movement) -er (write ⟶ writer) -ance (accept ⟶ acceptance)
Non-neutral morphemes	-ion (erode ⟶ erosion) -ous (danger ⟶ dangerous) -tion (receive ⟶ reception) -ify (the root grat- ⟶ gratify) -ity (necessary ⟶ necessity)

Table 1 shows that every type of derivational morphemes is represented five times, every sentence has a different derivational suffix. As mentioned above, neutral suffixes, such as -*ness, -er, -ize,* and -*ment,* have several properties that facilitate their acquisition by EFL learners. For instance, they are added to independent words, such as the suffix -*er* in *owner*; when it is removed from *owner*, the result is an independent word, *own*. Secondly, neutral suffixes do not modify stress or vowel quality in the word to which they are attached. Finally, the meaning of a word created from neutral suffixes is usually transparent and is related to the stem/root. Conversely, non-neutral suffixes, such as -*ity, -ify, -ion, -ian, -ous,* and -*ic*, differ from neutral suffixes in many respects. Firstly, they are often added to bound morphemes, stems/roots that cannot stand on their own. For instance, removing the suffix -*ify* in words like *gratify* or *quantify* produces dependent words, **grat* and **quant*, respectively. Secondly, non-neutral suffixes usually change stress and vowel quality in the stem/root to which they are attached, as illustrated by the difference in the stress and pronunciation of the segment *a* in *advantage* vs. *advantageous*. Finally, the meaning of words formed with non-neutral suffixes is usually not transparent, such as the words *carnival*, *carnivore* and *carnation*, which are formed from the root *cam* 'meat'.

Data analysis

In order to calculate the differences between the answers of the two groups of participants, I used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). I also calculated the percentages, means and standard deviations of the participants' answers on the tests. The reason for doing these calculations was to confirm or refute the hypotheses I formulated based on my observation. To be able to determine whether the differences between the two groups are statistically significant, a t-test was performed. In this type of test, the means of the two groups are compared statistically. The result of this test can provide an answer to the third research question. In order to supply an answer to the second research question, the percentages of the most problematic suffixes were calculated to determine the possible causes behind the errors.

Results and discussion

The main goal of this study is to measure the comprehension and production abilities of Kuwaiti EFL learners in terms of using deviational morphemes in English, and to account for the errors, if found. It also investigates whether the participants' English proficiency level affects their answers on the tests. Table 2 below shows the results of the t-test on the comprehension test.

Table 2. Results of t-test of differences between (ALs) and (ILs) with respect to the comprehension of derivational suffixes

Proficiency Level	N	M	SD	t	df	Sig.
Advanced Learners (ALs)	40	7.7	1.3	-14.91	88	0.0001**
Intermediate Learners (ILs)	50	6.2	1.6			

$**P <0.05$

Table 2 indicates that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant; since the P value is lower than (0.05). Specifically, ALs (m=7.7) performed better than ILs (m=6.2) on the comprehension test. This means that ALs supplied a higher number of correct answers as opposed to ILs, because the mean of ALs is higher than that of ILs. As a result, there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups on the test. The percentage of correct answers provided by ALs shows that the English proficiency level of the participants contributed to their correct answers on the test as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Percentage of correct answers by ALs and ILs on the comprehension test

Proficiency level	Percentage of correct answers
Advanced Learners (ALs)	77%
Intermediate Learners (ILs)	62 %
Total mean	70%

Table 3 shows that ALs obtained a higher score than ILs. It also demonstrates that the overall percentage of correct answers by both ALs and ILs (70%) may suggest that Kuwaiti EFL learners are aware of the correct use of English derivational suffixes on the comprehension test. Note, however, that the tested groups made a number of errors, showing that they probably had some difficulties related to the non-neutral derivational suffixes that change the stem/root of the word to which they are attached. The number and percentage of correct answers provided by both groups with regard to the 10 different derivational suffixes used on the test are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. Percentage of correct answers by ALs and ILs in terms of derivational suffixes on the comprehension test

Types of derivational morpheme	Participants		Mean of correct answers
	ALs	ILs	
-ness	85%	66%	76%
-able	80%	62%	71%
-ment	85%	70%	78%
-ance	75%	66%	70%
-er	90%	78%	84%
-ion	72.5%	52%	62%
-tion	70%	56%	63%
-ify	70%	52%	61%
-ity	65%	48%	57%
-ous	80%	66%	73%
Overall percentage of correct answers	77%	62%	70%

Table 4 suggests that the participants did not encounter many problems with certain items in comparison with others on the test. It seems that the participants produced more errors on some derivational morphemes, namely, *-ion* (62%), *-tion* (63%), *-ify* (61%), and *-ity* (57%). The common factor between these derivational suffixes is that all of them are non-neutral, changing the form of the stem/root to which they are attached. Investigating other types, the participants obtained good results on other types, namely, *-ness* (76%), *-ment* (78%), *-ance* (70%) and *-er* (84%). These derivational suffixes are attached to the root/stem without any modifications to the form of the stem. As a result, it may have been easier for the participants to memorize them and link them to other forms of the same word. However, one may argue that the participants achieved good results on the derivational suffix *-ous* (73%) even though this derivational suffix is non-neutral. Here, there are two possible reasons to account for this result: (1) the word used on the test is *dangerous*, which is very frequent; (2) the participants usually learn how to form derivational forms of *danger/dangerous* at an earlier stage of their life; and (3) the derivational suffix *–ous* does not change the stem *danger* to which it is attached, resulting in the word *danger-ous*, which is

quite predictable. In comparison with the words *necessary/necessity* and *erode/erosion*, there are modifications to the stem/root, accompanying the derivational suffixes *-ity* and *-ion*. Taking these points into consideration, it seems that EFL learners encounter more difficulties when they derive words with non-neutral suffixes. This is supported by analyzing the results of the production test, in the remainder of this section.

Looking at the results of the t-test, Table 5 shows the difference between the ALs and ILs on the production test.

Table 5. Results of t-test of differences between (ALs) and (ILs) on the production test

Proficiency Level	N	M	SD	t	df	Sig.
Advanced Learners (ALs)	40	6.4	1.6	-15.23	98	0.001**
Intermediate Learners (ILs)	50	4.8	1.8			

**P* <0.05

Examining Table 5, the *P* value is lower than (0.05), which means that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant. Specifically, ALs (m=6.4) outperformed their ILs counterparts (m=4.8) on the test. The means suggest that ALs produced a higher number of correct answers as opposed to ILs. As a result, there is a prominent statistical significance between the two groups on the test. The percentage of correct answers obtained by ALs shows that the English proficiency level of the participants had an impact on their correct answers on the test, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Percentage of correct answers by ALs and ILs on the production test

Proficiency level	Percentage of correct answers
Advanced Learners (ALs)	64%
Intermediate Learners (ILs)	48 %
Total mean	56%

Table 6 shows that the overall percentage of correct answers by both ALs and ILs (56%) may suggest that Kuwaiti EFL learners are not fully aware of the correct use of English derivational suffixes. It is apparent that the tested groups made a number of errors, showing that they, probably, have some difficulties when they produce these suffixes, especially the non-neutral ones. These results of the production test support those of the comprehension test, showing that the participants produced a higher number of errors with regard to non-neutral suffixes. The percentage of correct answers provided by both groups with respect to the ten suffixes on the production test is illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7. Percentage of correct answers by ALs and ILs in terms of derivational suffixes on the production test

Types of derivational morpheme	Participants		Mean of correct answers
	ALs	ILs	
-ness	70%	52%	61%
-able	65%	48%	57%
-ment	75%	60%	68%
-ance	65%	50%	58%
-er	80%	66%	73%
-ion	50%	32%	41%
-tion	55%	40%	48%
-ify	57.5%	36%	47%
-ity	55%	40%	48%
-ous	70%	56%	63%
Overall percentage of correct answers	64%	48%	56%

Table 7 demonstrates that the participants achieved higher scores on neutral derivational suffixes, namely, *-ness* (61%), *-ment* (68%), *-ance* (58%) and *-er* (73%). In contrast, the participants' performance on the non-neutral suffixes was not as good as that on the neutral ones, e.g. *-ion* (41%), *-tion* (48%), *-ify* (47%), and *-ity* (48%). In addition, when one looks at the incorrect answers the participants provided on the production test, the most noticeable errors were adding both *-ion* and *-tion* immediately to **illusorion* and **assumtion*, respectively. They tend to keep the stems/forms as they are without any modification. It appears that the participants are not aware of the difference between the two types of suffixes, and the changes they yield when added to stems/roots in English.

One may suggest that some part of the difficulty encountered by the participants could be attributed to the different morphological systems of L1 and L2. In particular, English morphology is concatenative, whereas Arabic exhibits both concatenative and non-concatenative morphology. Concatenative morphology is defined as a type of morphological analysis, which involves stringing morphemes together by affixation, whereas non-concatenative morphology is defined as a type of word-formation, in which the root itself is modified, and it does not involve stringing morphemes together by affixation (Altakhaineh, 2014, p. 12-13). In Arabic, there are some instances of concatenative morphology, such as the regular masculine plural suffix *-uun* in the word *muslim* 'Muslim'/ *muslim-uun* 'Muslims' (Altakhaineh, 2014, p. 13). However, a considerable number of instances in Arabic are non-concatenative, e.g. the root /k-t-b/, which denotes a sense of writing, has different forms, but semantically-related meanings as in *katab* 'he wrote', *kitaab* 'book', *maktuub* 'written' and *kaatib* 'writer' (Altakhaineh, 2014, p. 14). Therefore, it can be proposed that the difference

in the derivational systems between Arabic and English might be another reason behind the errors made on the test.

To sum up, Kuwaiti ALs performed better than ILs in terms of the use of derivational suffixes in English. ALs also performed better on the comprehension test than on the production one. The modification of the stem/root form, which takes place when non-neutral suffixes are added, seems to play a crucial role in the participants' use of these derivational suffixes. Finally, because Arabic and English morphological systems are different, this may result in inadequate awareness of how derivational suffixes are added, and the possible modifications that non-neutral suffixes demand in many cases.

Conclusion and recommendations

In conclusion, this study examined the ability of Kuwaiti EFL learners to acquire English derivational suffixes through testing their ability to choose the right suffix on the multiple-choice test, and their ability to produce the right word on the fill-in blank test. The overall percentage of correct answers of both ALs and ILs (63%) indicates that Kuwaiti EFL learners may be aware of the complex nature of derivational suffixes in English, to a certain degree. The results of the study also revealed that the English proficiency level of the participants had an impact on their use of English derivational suffixes. There was a statistically significant difference between the answers of ALs and ILs on both tests. In particular, ALs performed better than ILs. An analysis of the types of error demonstrated that both the changes that the non-neutral suffixes make to the word stems on the one hand, and L1 influence, on the other, play a pivotal role in the comprehension and production of derivational suffixes in English. Also, the frequency of the non-neutral suffix may reduce the amount of errors the participants make, i.e. *-ous*.

Taking all these findings into consideration, educational leaders, English teachers and curriculum designers in Kuwait need to develop and design the appropriate materials and activities to acquaint EFL learners with the appropriate use of derivational suffixes. They need to show Kuwaiti EFL learners that languages, around the globe, exhibit degrees of variance in their derivational systems. If such procedures are followed, Arab EFL learners in general, and Kuwaiti EFL learners in particular, may start comprehending and producing more accurate English words, especially given the fact that English derivational morphology is different from that of Arabic. EFL learners may also feel more comfortable and confident when they speak. Lastly, further exploration of the impact of non-neutral derivational morphemes on the production of stress and appropriate pronunciation in English could be worthy of further investigation.

References:

4. Alotaibi, A. M. (2016). The Use of Inflectional Morphemes by Kuwaiti EFL Learners. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(3), pp. 32-41.

5. Altakhaineh, A. R. M. (2014). *The Interaction between Inflection and Derivation in English and MSA: An Insightful Glimpse into the Boundaries.* Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

6. Altakhaineh, A. R. M., & Rahrouh, H. N. (2015). The use of euphemistic expressions by Arab EFL learners: Evidence from Al Ain University of Science and Technology. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(1), pp. 14-21.

7. Basnight-Brown, D. M., Chen, L., Hua, S., Kostić, A., & Feldman, L. B. (2007). Monolingual and bilingual recognition of regular and irregular English verbs: Sensitivity to form similarity varies with first language experience. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 57, pp. 65-80.

8. Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

9. Boey, L. K. (1977). *An Introduction to Linguistics for the Language Teacher*. Singapore University Press for Regional English Language Centre.

10. Farinde, R. O., & Ojo, J. O. (2000). *The Grammatical Structure of English: An Illustrative Approach*. Ondo: Patrick Ade Press.

11. Jia, G. (2006). Second language acquisition by native Chinese speakers. *Handbook of East Asian psycholinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

12. Jia, G., Aaronson, D., & Wu, Y. (2002). Long-term language attainment of bilingual immigrants: Predictive variables and language group differences. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23, pp. 599-621.

13. Josiah, U., & Udoudom, J. (2012). Morphophonemic analysis of inflectional morphemes in English and Ibibio nouns: Implications for linguistic studies. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 1(2), pp. 72-81.

14. Juffs, A. (1998). Some effects of first language argument structure and morphosyntax on second language sentence processing. *Second Language Research,* 14(4), pp. 406-424.

15. Kiparsky, P. (1982). From cyclic phonology to lexical phonology. *The Structure of Phonological Representations*, 1, pp. 131-175.

16. Koda, K. (2000). Cross-linguistic variations in L2 morphological awareness. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 21, pp. 297-320.

17. Nicol, D. (2007). E-assessment by design: Using multiple-choice tests to good effect. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 31 (1), pp. 53–64.
18. Silva, R., & Clahsen, H. (2008). Morphologically complex words in L1 and L2 processing: Evidence from masked priming experiments in English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 11(2), pp. 245-260.
19. Tomori, S. H. O. (1977). *The Morphology and Syntax of Present-day English: An Introduction*. London: Heinemann.
20. Tyler, A., & Nagy, W. (1989). The acquisition of English derivational morphology. *Journal of Memory & Language*, 28, pp. 649–667.

Appendix One
Part A (**Test one**)

❖ Please, circle your English proficiency level based on the English Placement Test (EPT):

A) **Advanced** B) **Intermediate**

Q1: Choose the answer that best completes the following sentences:

1. They reached an …………agreement ………that they will merge their firms next year.
a) agreement   b) agreeable   c) agreeably   d) I do not know
2. It was ………..necessary……….. to make these amendments to the book.
a) necessarily   b) necessity   c) necessary   d) I do not know
3. Time off work because of ……sickness………… is paid at the full rate.
a) sickly   b) sick   c) sickness   d) I do not know
4. Floods can cause ………erosion……… to happen very quickly.
a) erode   b) erosion   c) erosive   d) I do not know
5. Her praise will ……gratify………… all who worked so hard to earn it.
a) gratefully   b) gratify   c) grateful   d) I do not know
6. What can I do with………hazardous……… waste?
a) hazardous   b) hazard   c) hazardously   d) I do not know
7. Air ………pollution……… has reached alarming levels in some cities.
a) polluted   b) pollute   c) pollution   d) I do not know
8. She is a well-known ………writer……… of children's books.
a) write   b) writer c) writing   d) I do not know
9. The party marked his ………acceptance……… into the community.
a) accept   b) acceptance   c) accepted   d) I do not know
10. This project may be difficult, but I still think it is ……doable………….
a) do   b) did   c) doable   d) I do not know

Part B (**Test two**)
❖ Please, circle your English proficiency level based on the English Placement Test (EPT):

A) **Advanced** B) **Intermediate**

Q1: Fill in the blanks below with the correct form of the word in brackets.

1. I now have ………authority……… on the person who used to be my boss. (authority)
2. I have always had a ………fondness…………. for fast cars. (fond)
3. There is an ………assumption……… that people who live in this house are poor. (assume)
4. Could you .………clarify………. the first point please? I do not understand it completely. (clear)
5. A large mirror in a room can create the ………illusion………. of space. (illusory)
6. They are negotiating a peace ………settlement………. (settle)
7. Choosing furniture is largely a matter of personal ………preference………. . (prefer)
8. Each ………player………. takes three cards. (play)
9. These chemicals are ………dangerous………. to human health. (dangerous)
10. This kind of attitude is not ……acceptable…………. at all . (accept)

Appendix Two
Arabic sounds

Arabic consonants/vowels	Symbols	Description
ء	ʔ	voiceless glottal stop
ب	b	voiced bilabial stop
ت	t	voiceless dento-alveolar stop
ث	θ	voiceless inter-dental fricative
ج	j	voiced post-alveolar affricate
ح	<u>h</u>	voiceless pharyngeal fricative
خ	x	voiceless uvular fricative
د	d	voiced dento-alveolar stop
ذ	ð	voiced alveolar fricative
ر	r	voiced alveo-palatal trill
ز	z	voiced alveolar fricative
س	s	voiceless alveolar fricative
ش	ʃ	voiceless alveo-palatal fricative
ص	<u>s</u>	voiceless alveolar emphatic fricative
ض	<u>d</u>	voiced alveolar emphatic stop
ط	<u>t</u>	voiceless dento-alveolar emphatic stop
ظ	<u>ð</u>	voiced alveolar emphatic fricative
ع	ʕ	voiced pharyngeal fricative
غ	γ	voiced uvular fricative
ف	f	voiceless labio-dental fricative
ق	q/g	voiceless/voiced uvular stop
ك	k	voiceless velar stop
ل	l	voiced alveolar lateral
م	m	voiced bilabial nasal
ن	n	voiced alveolar nasal
ه	h	voiceless glottal fricative
و	w	voiced labio-velar glide
ي	y	voiced palatal glide
/ˈ/	a	low short central unrounded
/ˈ/	u	high short back rounded
/ِ /	i	high short front unrounded
آ	aa	low long central unrounded
وو	uu	high long back rounded
يي	ii	high long front unrounded
و	oː	mid long back rounded
او	aw	low short front unrounded + labio-velar glide
اي	ay	low short front unrounded + palatal glide
يي	ee	mid long front unrounded