

Aleksandra Janić  
Marta Veličković

## RECENT ADJECTIVAL ANGLICISMS AND THEIR SERBIAN EQUIVALENTS: AN ASSOCIATIVE APPROACH\*

The paper analyzes the various types of associative responses of L1 Serbian speakers (Serbian majors and English majors) to recent adjectival Anglicisms, and their levels of familiarity/acceptance. Forty monosemic Anglicisms and their equivalents were used as stimuli. Paradigmatic and syntagmatic responses were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The results indicated that the most frequent types of noted responses were syntagmatic, encyclopedic, and synonymous; that not all the recent Anglicisms are equally familiar/accepted in Serbian; and that the most familiar/accepted Anglicisms are either near synonyms of their equivalents or have specific distribution patterns with new meanings. No statistically significant impact of the level of English language proficiency was noted in the study (ANOVA), but statistically significant differences were noted for individual types of associative responses to the Anglicisms as stimuli (the T-test).

*Key words:* Serbian language, recent Anglicisms, adjectives, associative method, students of philology.

У раду се анализирају типови асоцијативних реакција изворних говорника српског језика (студената Србистике и Англистике) на новије придевске англицизме, као и степен њихове познатости/прихватљивости. По 40 једнозначних англицизама и њихових пандана дати су као стимулуси. Квалитативно и квантитативно су анализирани реакције синтагматског и парадигматског типа. Истраживање је показало да су најчешћи типови реакција синтагматске, енциклопедијске, синонимске, да новији англицизми нису подједнако познати/прихватљиви и да су најпознатији/најприхватљивији англицизми синонимима устаљеним панданима са новим значењима у специфичним контекстима. Уочено је одсуство статистичке значајности утицаја нивоа познавања енглеског (АНОВА), али јесу уочене статистички значајне разлике у погледу појединачних типова асоцијативних реакција на англицизме (Т-тест).

*Кључне речи:* српски језик, новији англицизми, придеви, асоцијативни метод, студенти филологије.

**1. INTRODUCTION.** The aim of this study was to analyze the characteristics of the associative fields of recent adjectival Anglicisms and their Serbian equivalents among a population of philology students, as well as to compare the types of associative responses between a group of Serbian language majors (SLMs) on the one hand, and English language majors (ELMs) on the other. The SLMs were selected for participation due to their unique understanding of the Serbian language, while the ELMs were selected for their English language proficiency levels.

The measuring instrument used in this study was a questionnaire, which took the form of a word association task (WAT). It consisted of 80 stimuli selected for

---

\* This research was funded by the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia, *Structuring Concept Generation with the Help of Metaphor, Analogy and Schematicity – SCHEMAS* (Grant No. 7715934), and supported by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovations of the Republic of Serbia (Contract No. 451-03-47/2023-01/ 200165).

associative responses, 40 in the form of Anglicisms and 40 of their Serbian equivalents, extracted from the *Srpski rečnik novijih anglicizama* (SRNA 2021). The associative method was used to determine how the recent selected adjectival Anglicisms as stimuli (such as *asistiran*, *autorizovan*, *devastiran*, etc.) fit into the network of the Serbian mental lexicon by comparing them to their Serbian equivalents (such as *potpomognut*, *ovlašćen*, *razoren*, etc.). The study thus aims to present the dominant lexico-semantic relations between the provided associative responses for all the stimuli. The responses were grouped based on the specific paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations which were found to exist between each stimulus and its response. At the same time, the responses were quantifiably presented as percentages for the entire population, then for each sub-group individually, and finally in the form of results of relevant statistical analyses.

**2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.** This section provides a brief overview of some of the key concepts relevant for the study: Anglicisms, existing research on their status in Serbian, and WATs as a means of their study.

**2.1. ANGLICISMS AS A CONSEQUENCE OF LANGUAGE CONTACT.** When it comes to Anglicisms in general, Gottlieb and Furiassi (2015) claimed that the ever-increasing contact among various non-native speakers of English led to the occurrence of what they refer to as ‘internationalisms’, of which both Anglicisms proper, and false Anglicisms as their subgroup, are a part. However, as they also contend, differences will be noted in their use and interpretation (including catachresis) in different linguistic environments. They also add an interesting twist to the status of Anglicisms, claiming that they are, in effect, all examples of pseudo-English, born through the willing collaboration of two languages (GOTTLIEB – FURIASSI 2015: 18–19).

Working within the Serbo-Croatian linguistic environment, Filipović (1990) defined Anglicisms as: “svaka riječ preuzeta iz engleskog jezika koja označava neki predmet, ideju ili pojam kao sustavne djelove engleske civilizacije; ona ne mora biti engleskog porijekla, ali mora biti adaptirana prema sustavu engleskog jezika i integrirana u engleski vokabular” (FILIPOVIĆ 1990: 17). In addition, he also stated that Anglicisms are used to fill existing gaps in the recipient language (RL) lexicon (FILIPOVIĆ 1990: 15). A slightly different, more pragmatic, approach to the study of Anglicisms was outlined by Prčić (2019<sup>3</sup>: 59), who states that an Anglicism is: 1) a lexeme or bound morpheme originating from English now being used in Serbian, characterized by varying degrees of integration into the RL; 2) a word, syntagm, or clause in the Serbian language whose use reflects the norms of the English language, including the orthographic, phonological, grammatical, semantic, and of course pragmatic one. Further in the same text Prčić (2019<sup>3</sup>: 141) defines the prototypical Anglicism: justifiable, clear, and fully adapted to the Serbian language (such as *kompjuter*, *tinejdžer*).

Anglicisms in the Serbian language are mostly related to the sphere of everyday communication, including objects, trends, and occurrences which are usually relatively new. That their adoption is justified under certain circumstances was proposed by Silaški (2012: 73): “U kontekstu brzih društvenih i naučnih promena u današnjem svetu, u mnogim slučajevima, posebno u odsustvu odgovarajućeg domaćeg termina ili usled nemogućnosti adekvatnog prevoda, usvajanje anglicizma je opravdano i svakako predstavlja pojavu koja obogaćuje jezički fond”.

Considering the extent to which Anglicisms have permeated the Serbian language to date, they have been studied from a variety of different perspectives (PANIĆ-KAVGIĆ 2006; MIŠIĆ ILIĆ 2011; 2014; 2017; DRLJAČA MARGIĆ 2011; FILIPOVIĆ-KOVAČEVIĆ 2011; SIŁAŠKI 2012; MILIĆ 2013; MIŠIĆ ILIĆ – LOPIĆIĆ 2011; 2014; ĐORĐEVIĆ 2017; PRĆIĆ 2019<sup>3</sup>; STAMENKOVIĆ – TASIĆ 2020; ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ 2021; ЈАНИЋ – СТАМЕНКОВИЋ 2022, inter alia). Mišić Ilić and Vesna Lopičić (MIŠIĆ ILIĆ 2011; MIŠIĆ ILIĆ – LOPIĆIĆ 2011) adopted the view that every language manifests itself in several varieties, and that the impact of the English language created a specific variety of Serbian. A complete description of this variety requires a socio-linguistic, ethno-linguistic, and pragmatic approach, in addition to the semantic, lexicographic, and contact linguistic ones already in use. In their work, they also supported the view that Anglicisms are predominantly used by a higher-educated, younger, urban population to facilitate communication in specific circumstances, and as a means of identifying with a group or of following a trend. Gottlieb and Furiassi (2015: 9) go so far as to suggest that non-native speakers of English might even coin fake Anglicisms to create the image of an individual with status, importance, prestige, etc.

2.2. WATs AND THE LEXICON. WATs, which have seen a resurgence of interest at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, have proved to be quite beneficial for determining the core meaning of Anglicisms and the patterns of their everyday use and distribution. For example, in his 2009 volume, Meara re-introduced the term *word association networks* to describe how the meaning of one group of words can be used to explain that of another. An association network, in brief, relies on the lexical and semantic connections between stimuli and their responses to delineate the structure of the respondents' mental lexicon (cf. SINGLETON 1999; ZAREVA 2007). WATs have in general, with minor exceptions (such as ПИПЕР – ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ – СТЕФАНОВИЋ 2005; ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ 2010; ЈАНКОВИЋ – ЈАКИЋ ШИМШИЋ 2021, to name but a few), not been used extensively in the Serbian linguistic community, rendering them an under-researched means of studying the relationships between recent Anglicisms and their Serbian equivalents.

The associative method in general, and WATs, have in one form or another found their place in numerous fields of study, including foreign language learning and teaching (FITZPATRICK 2006; 2007; 2015). In a practical sense, WATs are a simple, quick, and efficient way of compiling L1 or L2 data (FITZPATRICK et al. 2013), which are both syntagmatic and paradigmatic in nature (cf. MEARA 2009; ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ 2010). Since automatic processes are thought to reflect the structure of the mental lexicon (DURRANT – DOHERTY 2010), WATs are suited to the study of the level of acceptance of Anglicisms, inter alia (ZHANG 2017). For instance, in the current study, a WAT was used to obtain responses to stimuli originating from the Serbian language (i.e., Serbian equivalents), which provided normative associations in relation to which it was possible to analyze responses provided to stimuli that originated from the English language (in this instance, a group of selected Anglicisms).

WATs provide a way for researchers to analyze the expected impact of the respondents' L1 on what they comprehend to be the core meaning of FL words (cf. KHAZAEENEZHAD – ALIBABAEI 2013; HE – DENG 2015). Some data indicate that providing associative responses to an FL stimulus is linked to translation. Namely,

if EFL speakers have lower levels of proficiency, they may resort to an ‘intermediary’ step, whereby they translate the stimulus before providing their response (KROLL – STEWART 1994; FITZPATRICK – IZURA 2011). Greidanus and Nienhus (2001) also weighed in on the issue of proficiency, indicating that it might not be the most optimal factor to take into consideration. Instead, they indicated that fluency is the more revealing factor, as it ties in with all the aspects of knowledge of a word. This is otherwise known as ‘depth of knowledge’ and can quantifiably be presented by the number of links a word, in this instance a stimulus in a WAT, establishes with other words that make up the respondent’s mental lexicon (cf. FITZPATRICK – THWAITES 2020). Along the same lines, Ufimtseva (2014: 43) concludes that associative experiments can reveal: 1) “common and specific characteristics which are present in a bearer of a certain culture’s consciousness and subconsciously determine his/her behavior, estimations and attitude to the world”; 2) “the role of the first (native) language in forming the worldview of the native culture”; 3) “the influence of culture on its bearer’s language consciousness”.

Jiang (2019: 10) concluded that the FL mental lexicon actually consists of words that make up a gradient scale, on which they range from less to better known ones, while McCarthy (1990) stated that the human mind is far less of a dictionary when it comes to vocabulary acquisition, and instead resembles a network of mutually connected lexemes that can then be subjected to analysis. A similar approach can be found in Dragičević (2005: 60), who stated that the connections that exist between lexemes in the form of responses and those in the form of stimuli can indicate: coordination (*vrabac, lasta, senica, golub*), collocability (*piti – koka-kolu*), hyponymy (*ptica – vrabac*), antonyms (*crn – beo*), synonyms (*sreća – radost*), cause and effect relationships (*novac – bogatstvo*), and even situational ties (*konac – igla*).

It is also possible to use WATs to gain insight into what might be referred to as the ‘status’ of English and Serbian in a particular speech community, that is, the speech community’s preference for lexical items originating from one language or the other. Mišić Ilić (2014) has supported the view shared by other Serbian linguists (cf. PRĆIĆ 2014) that there are what can only be referred to as ‘subjective’ criteria for the use of Anglicisms which are guided by the speaker’s personal motives. She also cited encyclopedic knowledge as a factor that should be taken into consideration when analyzing speaker choice pertaining to the use of Anglicisms. Furthermore, based on Prčić (2019<sup>3</sup>), it is also possible to identify any potential meaning changes that a borrowed item such as an Anglicism may have undergone, i.e., whether the Anglicism is showing signs of suppressing the existing Serbian equivalent in naturally occurring language, whether it has assumed a new meaning, etc.

2.3. ASSOCIATIVE RESPONSES TO ADJECTIVAL STIMULI: AN OVERVIEW. Back in the 1960s, McNeill (1963) first proposed what is today taken as a matter of fact: that the most frequently expected associative response to an adjective is a paradigmatic response in the form of another adjective (i.e., a member of the same word class), with the added expectation that it should also be its antonym. Not long after that, the semantic component of words began to assume a more prominent position in theoretical and applied linguistic research. It was linked to the order of things in nature, i.e., what we now refer to as our non-linguistic knowledge of the world. For example, Deese (1964) explained that the associative responses given to adjectives as stimuli should

be analyzed based on their distribution patterns. In particular, the focus should be on the overlaps ('partial contextual equivalences') that occur among them. This pointed researchers in the direction of the paradigmatic responses that emerged from these equivalences, which are linked to the aforementioned non-linguistic knowledge of the world around us, i.e., to 'contingencies in nature'. Thus, the stage was set for including both paradigmatic responses and encyclopedic knowledge into the study of associative responses. This approach is still being implemented today, as an associative verbal network still "reflects the entire previous verbal and nonverbal experience of native speakers" (UFIMTSEVA 2014: 37).

At the same time, syntagmatic relations cannot be excluded from the scope of analysis. They are based on frequency of occurrence and thus frequency of exposure, i.e., past contiguities. This creates anticipation regarding potential associative responses. However, frequency of occurrence is not the way paradigmatic responses are learnt. This would require listing synonymous adjectives in a single discourse situation, as per the hypothesis of intersubstitution (MCNEILL 1963), which is found only in specific situations such as the educational setting. Thus, the answer to the question of how intersubstitutional words become associated is that they are found in a distribution overlap as a measure of communality.

Deese (1964: 347) went on to describe the potential distribution patterns of responses for adjectival stimuli: uncommon adjectives as stimuli will most frequently provide syntagmatic relations (*administrative decision*), while more common adjectives will elicit other adjectives (*hot-cold*) with the underlying assumption that they are based on 'fundamental contrasts' that have to do with our non-linguistic knowledge of the world. Following through with this assumption in his own research which focused on the associations to 278 adjectives of the English language, he concluded that it is incorrect to expect the first associative response to be an antonym, and that the 'polar opposite schema' does not work for all English adjectives. Much the same conclusion was also reached by Piper, Dragičević, and Stefanović (2005: 97), who stated that paradigmatic associations are more frequently linked to familiar than to less frequent and unfamiliar adjectival stimuli.

Rotberg (1968) introduced an alternative methodology to the study of adjectives. Instead of simply providing a single associative response to each stimulus, her respondents wrote (five) chained responses for each one. She compared these multiple responses to those where only one was provided. The former approach led to more responses (mediators) that could be labelled encyclopedic responses (those independent of each other) and are indicative of "deep associative relations" (ROTBERG 1968: 848). However, working on a sample of Serbian language material consisting of 10 stimuli in the form of lexemes which do have antonyms (the adjectives *beo*, *crn*, *levi*, *velik*, *hladan*; the nouns *zemlja*, *brat*, *majka*, *kokoška*, *vučica*) and the responses provided to them by 90 adult respondents, Dragičević (2007, and originally in her unpublished MA thesis from 1993) confirmed the dominance of responses with opposite meanings, especially in the case of stimuli that have established antonyms, independently of the context in which they were used. By comparing 61 pairs of adjectives, Todić (2016: 95–96) determined that the diversity of associative responses to various adjectival stimuli lay in the stronger bond between the primary/core meanings of adjectives in the case of true antonymy.

For example, the strongest associative link was found in pairs such as *levi–desni*, a somewhat weaker one in *lenj–vredan*, and the weakest in pairs such as *vladin–nevladin* (2016: 101).

Jakić Šimšić (2021) also contributed to this discussion when she analyzed whether the free associations of respondents to adjectival stimuli more often take the form of nouns or of adjectives (predominantly antonyms). By analyzing the associative fields of 40 adjectives extracted from the *Asocijativni rečnik srpskog jezika* (APCJ 2005), she concluded that 52% of the responses were nouns, 44% were adjectives, while all the other remaining responses amounted to 4% (ЈАКИЋ ШИМШИЋ 2021: 192). From among the adjectives, near synonyms and polar opposite antonyms in sum made up approximately 50% of the responses (2021: 192).

When analyzing the conceptualizations of sharpness/bluntness in English and Serbian, Halas Popović (2022: 167) proved that sharpness owes its strong potential for association with abstract domains in the English and Serbian language to its complexity (consistent form, permeability of the surface, etc.). She reached the same conclusion by analyzing sharpness/bluntness as the source domain of conceptual metaphors in English and Serbian (ХАЛАС ПОПОВИЋ 2021). Association networks, the mental lexicon, and encyclopedic knowledge are already being used to study language and the way human beings organize their knowledge of the world, and to determine the way in which an (abstract) occurrence is conceptualized (ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ 2007).

The motivation for the use of Anglicisms in general in the Serbian linguistic environment was studied by Stamenković and Tasić (2020). On a sample of university students, English language majors and Engineering Management students, they determined that the presence or absence of context impacts the respondents' perception of the justifiability of using an Anglicism ( $p < 0.01$ ). Related factors found to be of relevance include the existence of a context for the use of the Anglicism in question, and the existence of synonyms with a difference in meaning (STAMENKOVIĆ – TASIĆ 2020: 234). The following quote supports this view: "Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as interlingual synonymy; having settled in a different lexicological context, with differing semantic distinctions and overlaps, no imported word is able to carry its foreign semantic field and network with it into a new language" (GOTTLIEB – FURIASSI, 2015: 18). Furthermore, Milić (2013: 118) concluded that what are often referred to as partial synonyms do have a shared denotative meaning, but that the differences between two lexical items linked by partial synonymy are a consequence of their associative meaning, range of distribution patterns, selectional restrictions, or the grammatical standard.

Stamenković and Tasić (2020: 234–235) ascribe the influence of the presence/absence of context to the fact that the respondents could imagine a variety of them where the Anglicisms would be more suited. This was even more evident for the English language majors, who had experience with translation, and had a better sense of when an Anglicism was, justifiably, required in the Serbian language. The impact of context on the perception and evaluation of the justifiability of Anglicisms was only registered for those which have Serbian equivalents, but also similar, novel, or altered meanings.

Based on the aforementioned, the following hypotheses were formed:

1) More missing and unrelated responses will be recorded for stimuli that are Anglicisms than for those that are Serbian equivalents, which will be an indicator of the comprehension, familiarity, and level of acceptance of these Anglicisms in the Serbian language.

2) The expected responses to the adjectival stimuli will predominantly take the form of adjectives (antonyms or, alternatively, synonyms).

3) Even though the individual pairs of adjectival stimuli are listed as synonyms, differences in meaning between them will still be noted.

4) The syntagmatic responses will show that the analyzed recent adjectival Anglicisms are not entrenched as frequent collocations in the Serbian language, whereby the measure of comparison are the syntagmatic relations of their Serbian equivalents.

5) Encyclopedic responses will indicate differences in the way the recent Anglicisms and their Serbian equivalents are interpreted.

6) Differences are expected between the SLMs and ELMs for all the types of responses based on varying levels of English language proficiency.

### 3. THE METHOD

3.1. THE SAMPLE OF PARTICIPANTS. A total of 100 respondents (average age 21.3 years, age range 18–43<sup>1</sup>), our convenience sample, voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. The female respondents made up 75% of the sample, while the male respondents made up 25%. All of the respondents were philology students at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš (54 were students of the Department of Serbian Language and Literature and 46 were students of the Department of English)<sup>2</sup>. The respondents included 23 first-year students, 26 second-year students, 24 third-year students, 18 fourth-year students, 7 MA students, and 2 PhD students. Forty-six students were from South-East Serbia and East Serbia, 46 from South Serbia, and 8 from Central Serbia. Most of the respondents (79%), reported that they were currently residing in Niš (the average number of years spent living in Niš is 11.37 years), while 35% stated that they had been born there.

All of the respondents were native speakers of Serbian. None of them reported having lived and/or studied abroad. Their self-reported proficiency levels of English varied from A1 to C2. A1 was reported by 1%, A2 by 5%, B1 by 12%, B2 by 23%, C1 by 16%, and C2 by 12% of the respondents, while 31% did not provide a self-evaluation of their English language proficiency level, which was then determined based on their English language course requirements. Both the SLMs and ELMs had studied English as a foreign language for 8 years during their elementary school education, and for 4 years during their high school education.

<sup>1</sup> Our sample of respondents included both undergraduate, MA and PhD students. The majority of our respondents were aged between 18 and 24. There are two respondents considerably above the aforementioned age range. One respondent, aged 30, is a doctoral student at the Department of English. The other is a 43-year-old first-year student at the Department of Serbian Language and Literature.

<sup>2</sup> That students of the Department of English are a population well-suited to the study of Anglicisms in Serbian was supported by Stamenković and Tasić (2020).

3.2. THE MEASURING INSTRUMENT. A questionnaire, in Google Forms format, was designed specifically for the purpose of this study. The link to the questionnaire was sent to the institutional email addresses of all the students of the aforementioned departments. They completed the questionnaire online in October and November 2022.

The first section of the questionnaire consists of a set of socio-demographic questions which refer to the respondents' age, place of birth and residence, their current field of study, current year of study, and knowledge of foreign languages. This section is followed by 80 tasks, each requiring the respondents to provide their first association to the given adjectival stimulus. The stimuli were presented to the respondents in Cyrillic script, in alphabetical order according to the Cyrillic alphabet, in masculine singular positive form (as is the lexicographical standard in Serbian), individually, to limit possible priming effects. As in all associative studies, the stimuli were decontextualized. This feature was considered to be another advantage of the associative method for the study of Anglicisms, as it enables respondents to focus on the type of lexical item and increases the rate of recognition (ONYSKO 2007: 105), also allowing the respondents to come up with and select the most suitable contexts for the Anglicism on their own (STAMENKOVIĆ – TASIĆ 2020: 235).

A total of 40 pairs of adjectives (an Anglicism and its Serbian equivalent) were included in the questionnaire. The Anglicisms were all extracted from the *Srpski rečnik novijih anglicizama* (SRNA 2021). Both co-authors took equal part in the selection process and only the Anglicisms that they both agreed upon were included in the study. The inclusion criteria for each Anglicism were the following: 1) that it had a monolexicemic Serbian equivalent recorded in the source dictionary; 2) that it was monosemic and not homonymous in nature; 3) that it was not a hyphenated word; and 4) that it was not slang.

The list of 40 pairs of stimuli included:

*asistirān–potpomognut, autorizovan–ovlašćen, beking–prateći, devastiran–razoren, dualan–dvostruk, finalizovan–završen, forvardovan–prosleđen, frendli–prijetan, grogi–ošamućen, hektičan–užurban, implementiran–primenjen, indor–unutrašnji, izigoing–ležeran, kjut–simpatičan, kripti–jeziv, krispi–hrskav, krucijalan–odlučujući, lajkabilan–dopadljiv, loukost–povoljan, lukrativan–unosan, mesi–neuredan, militari–vojnički, nutritivan–hranljiv, originalan–izvorni, personalni–lični, pinovan–istaknut, portabl–prenosan, promo–reklamni, promptan–brz, relaksopuštajući, revolving–obnovljiv, rezilijentan–izdržljiv, sajber–kompjuterski, smartpametān, sparkling–svetlucav, spuki–sablastan, tagovan–označen, transgresivan–nekonvencionalan, transplantiran–presaden, zipovan–spakovan.*

3.3. THE PROCEDURE. In sum, 8000 responses were compiled and were ultimately classified under the headings: synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, syntagmatic relations, encyclopedic responses, derivatives, missing responses, and unrelated responses. Due to constraints pertaining to space, only general tendencies and specific examples are presented.<sup>3</sup> A brief quantitative analysis provided the

<sup>3</sup> To present more of our findings, we would like to illustrate the aforementioned classification established by Dragičević (2005: 60) by using examples from our corpus: coordination (*štap–štaka*), collocability (*unutrašnji organ*), hyponymy (*označen–podvučen*), antonyms (*unutrašnji–spoljašnji*),



number of classified responses for each type (in percentages). The data were also analyzed using the Independent samples T-test and the ANOVA test, and were subsequently included in a more detailed qualitative analysis.

Both authors participated in the classification and labeling of the types of associative responses for the purpose of reliability. If an adjective is neuter singular, due to an identical morpho-phonemic realization and its marked form it was considered an adverb (for example, *važno, slatko, jezivo*).

Some explanations may be required regarding the classification and labeling process in the case of paradigmatic relations. Assigning the label of 'synonym' required that we refer to the dictionary definition of the stimulus and the lexemes provided therein. Determining the presence of hyponymy also required that we consult the dictionary definition of the stimulus, even though hypernyms and hyponyms are not explicitly listed therein. In order to provide as detailed an analysis as possible, and determine any potential specific meanings of the given stimuli, it was necessary to include hyponymy in the classification and labeling process, despite the fact that it is more difficult to apply it to the category of adjectives, unlike, for instance, to the category of nouns. Examples of hyponymy noted in the responses to the given stimuli include the following: *brz-pokretan, dopadljiv-ljubazan, istaknut-boldiran, označen-žigosan, presađen-pomeren*.

As far as antonyms are concerned, their occurrence was expected if the stimuli in question had one. This was infrequently the case in our study, except in the most obvious of examples.<sup>4</sup> Table 1 provides an overview of the frequency of occurrences, in percentages, of all the types of recorded responses for the Anglicisms and Serbian equivalents as stimuli.

Types of responses	Anglicisms	Serbian equivalents
Synonyms	23.58%	19.78%
Encyclopedic responses	22.7%	20.8%
Syntagmatic relations	22.45%	40.37%
Missing responses	16.68%	3.98%
Unrelated responses	13%	7.3%
Hyponyms	1.75%	6%
Derivatives	0.38%	0.63%
Antonyms	0.15%	1.25%

Table 1. An overview of the types of responses (in percentages)

Since not all the types of responses were considered equally relevant for the qualitative analysis, some were excluded. They were, however, included in the

synonyms (*militari-vojnički*), cause and effect relationships (*nutritivan-vitamin*), and even situational ties (*tanjir-hrana*). The final two were subsumed under the heading of encyclopedic responses.

<sup>4</sup> At this point we would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers who pointed out that adjectives in the Serbian language usually do not have true antonyms, that those that do mainly take the form of simple adjectives of Slavic origin. These adjectives are frequently lexical units which do not have corresponding Anglicisms. It would seem that the adjectival stimuli we extrapolated from the dictionary for the most part did not have true antonyms. This feature was also not among the inclusion criteria for the adjectival stimuli selected for the study.

quantitative analysis. The qualitative analysis included synonymy, hyponymy, encyclopedic responses, and syntagmatic relations. Derivatives and antonyms were excluded due to low frequency of occurrence (1.01% and 1.4%, respectively), while missing responses (20.66%) cannot be subjected to a qualitative analysis. Unrelated responses (20.3%) were also excluded due to a lack of contiguity and semantic congruence.

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. (NEAR) SYNONYMOUS, HYPONYMOUS, SYNTAGMATIC, AND ENCYCLOPEDIA RE-SPONSES. We first present the results of the analysis of the so-called true synonyms, near synonyms, as well as the lexemes with visibly more general or narrow meanings which were included under the heading of hyponymy. The subsequent paragraphs will present the results of the analysis of responses included under the heading of syntagmatic relations and encyclopedic knowledge.

Synonymous responses on average account for 21.68% of the responses per stimulus, ranging from 0 (*beking, obnovljiv*) to 58 (*krucijalan*). The average number of synonymous responses to the Anglicisms is only somewhat greater (23.6%) than that to the equivalents (19.78%). On average, hyponymy was noted in 3.89% of the responses per stimulus, ranging from 0 (*beking, grogi*, etc.) to 42 (*izdržljiv*). Despite their overall low average scores, the equivalents indicated that they had a greater tendency towards hyponymy (6%) than recent Anglicisms (1.75%).

The corresponding Serbian equivalent was provided as the response to 10.4% of the Anglicisms as stimuli, while the corresponding recent Anglicism was the response to 1.8% of the equivalents as stimuli. Despite being listed as synonyms, the Serbian equivalents are still used more frequently than their corresponding Anglicisms.

For the following Anglicisms, no equivalents were provided as responses: *beking, krucijalan, loukost*. On the other hand, the following equivalents were included among the responses provided for the Anglicisms: *lični* (16%), *hranjiv* (12%), *izvorni* (7%), *potpomognut* (7%), *označen* (5%), *pametn* (4%), *prenosan* (5%), *odlučujući* (2%), *ošamućen* (2%), *ovlašćen* (2%), *prosleđen* (2%), *svetlucav* (2%), *neuredan* (1%), *presađen* (1%), *primenjen* (1%), *reklamni* (1%), *simpatičan* (1%), *unosan* (1%).

The average number of different synonyms provided for the Anglicisms is approximately 4%, while in the case of the equivalents it was 5% per stimulus.

The Anglicisms with a greater than average number (more than 4%) of synonymous responses include:

*originalan* (16%), *krucijalan* (11%), *finalizovan* (10%), *asistirani* (8%), *frendli* (8%), *pinovan* (8%), *devastiran* (7%), *spuki* (7%), *sparkling* (6%), *transplantiran* (6%), *zipovan* (6%), *dualan* (5%), *hektičan* (5%), *lukrativan* (5%);

while the equivalents with a greater than average number (more than 5%) of synonymous responses are:

*istaknut* (14%), *izvorni* (12%), *odlučujući* (12%), *označen* (11%), *nekonvencionalan* (9%), *sablstan* (9%), *ovlašćen* (8%), *potpomognut* (8%), *prijatan* (8%), *prenosan* (7%), *razoren* (7%), *završen* (7%), *opuštajući* (6%), *ošamućen* (6%), *presađen* (6%), *užurban* (6%).

If we were to compare the recent Anglicisms and their Serbian equivalent as pairs, in 23 the number of synonyms is greater for the Anglicism, in 15 it was greater for the equivalent, while in two pairs the number of responses per stimulus was equal (*autorizovan* and *ovlašćen*, *spuki* and *sablstan*).

In the following pairs, responses that were included under the heading of hyponymy were recorded for both the Anglicism and the equivalent:

*kripi* (13%) – *sablstan* (2%), *zipovan* (5%) – *spakovan* (8%), *nutritivan* (5%) – *hranjiv* (6%), *pinovan* (3%) – *istaknut* (9%), *frendli* (1%) – *prijatan* (5%), *autorizovan* (5%) – *ovlašćen* (1%), *loukost* (3%) – *povoljan* (1%), *transplantiran* (1%) – *presaden* (6%), *asistirani* (1%) – *potpomognut* (1%).

Even though the *Srpski rečnik novijih anglicizama* (SRNA 2021) lists the analyzed stimuli as synonyms, our analysis determined a greater frequency and diversity of lexemes with a more general meaning among the responses for the equivalents, indicating that the Anglicisms have more specific meanings.

What follows is an analysis of the aforementioned specific meanings. The stimulus *nekonvencionalan* has a broader, more general meaning compared to *transgresivan*, which deviates from what is considered the norm when it comes to certain types of behavior: *drugačiji* (8%), *neobičajan* (5%), *neobičan* (3%), *različiti* (3%), *nesvakidašnji* (2%), *netipičan* (2%), *bezakonit* (1%), *neočekivan* (1%), *neprihvaćen* (1%), while the only provided response with an altogether different meaning was noted for the stimulus *transgresivan*: *prekršen* (1%).

A characteristic synonym for the adjective *unutrašnji* was *interni*, which is more often associated with the organization of a project than the physical interior of a room; therefore, a clear difference in meaning is indicated. Compared to the synonymous responses to the Anglicism *originalan*, the responses to the equivalent *izvorni* have the more specific meaning of ‘origin’: *maternji* [jezik], *matični*, *rodni* and *autohtoni*. The more specific meaning of the Anglicism in the pair *pinovan*–*istaknut* was confirmed by the (near) synonymous responses of *prikačen*, *zakačen*, *nabockan*, which link it to the English language word *pin*. On the other hand, for the pair *portabl*–*prenosan* a more specific meaning of the synonymous responses was noted for the equivalent *prenosan*, which could refer to the transmission of a disease: *zarazan*. For the pair *sajber*–*kompjuterski*, the (near) synonymous reactions have indicated a broader meaning for the Anglicism, as it encompasses the meanings of both the adjective *elektronski* and *onlajn*. In the pair *sparkling*–*svetlučav*, the synonymous responses indicated that the Anglicism refers to sparkling beverages, which is not one of the meanings of the equivalent.

For 32 pairs of the adjectival stimuli (77.5%), no semantic difference was noted among the synonymous responses provided to the Anglicism and the equivalent. Smaller differences were noted for the pair *transgresivan*–*nekonvencionalan*, and greater for the pairs: *indor*–*unutrašnji*, *originalan*–*izvorni*, *pinovan*–*istaknut*, *portabl*–*prenosan*, *sajber*–*kompjuterski*, *sparkling*–*svetlučav*.

When it comes to hyponymous responses, those provided for the adjective *zipovan* refer to computers, while those provided for its equivalent *spakovan* indicate a more general meaning than that of the Anglicism: *spremljen*, *sklopljen*, considering that *kofer*, *ranac* or *torba* can also possess the feature of *spakovani*, but not that of *zipovani* (which would collocate with *folder*, *datoteka*, etc.). The

situation is much the same for the pair *pinovan*–*istaknut*, whereby the Anglicism is linked to social networks, while the equivalent *istaknut* has a more general meaning confirmed by the hypernyms: *glavni*, *izdvojen*, *izložen*, *pokazan*, *viđen*, but also the hyponym *boldiran* which refers to font typesets. As far as the pair *tagovan*–*označen* is concerned, the use of the Anglicism *tagovan* is related to social networks, while the equivalent *označen* can have a wide-ranging use, indicated by the hyponyms *štrikliran* and *podvučen*. The adjective *forvardovan* refers to sending emails, meaning that it has an additional semantic component compared to *prosleđen* (for example, responses to this equivalent include *podeljen*, *isporučen*, *prenesen*, *predat*). The stimulus *rezilijentan* refers more to physical resistance, which is evident in the responses *jak*, *borben*, while a broader meaning is included in the equivalent *izdržljiv*, to which the responses were *čvrst*, *dugotrajan*, *nepokolebljiv*, *postojan*. The Anglicism *transplantiran* usually refers to the process of organ transplantation, and not to repotting plants as is the case for the equivalent. Hyponymy among the responses to the equivalent *presađen* is evident in *prenet* and *ugrađen*.

Therefore, the Anglicisms and their equivalents were not necessarily always mutually interchangeable, which speaks to the justifiability of using certain Anglicisms in the Serbian language (cf. SILAŠKI 2012). These findings confirm hypothesis 3. Differences in meaning within individual pairs of adjectival stimuli were noted, irrespective of the fact that they were presented as synonyms in the dictionary.

When it comes to the analysis of syntagmatic relations and their link to encyclopedic knowledge, as further examples of the lexico-semantic relations pertaining to the meanings of the pairs of adjectival stimuli, similar findings were obtained for both types of responses. On average, 31.4% of the responses for each stimulus were syntagmatic relations. They ranged from 2 (*grog*) to as many as 68 (*promo*) per stimulus. There were 22.45% syntagmatic responses on average for the Anglicisms, and 40.37% for the equivalents, which amounted to almost twice as many. On the other hand, there were 21.65% encyclopedic responses per stimulus, ranging from a minimum of 2 (*prijatan*) to a maximum of 57 (*kjut*). The average number of encyclopedic responses for the Anglicisms is 22.7%, and for the Serbian equivalents is 20.8%. The difference is in favor of the Anglicisms, but is too slight to be relevant.

Syntagmatic relations are defined as tendencies for the co-occurrences of certain words in a particular language (FINCH 2000: 52; PRČIĆ 2016<sup>3</sup>: 149). They have also been defined as “proziran sintagmatski spoj dveju leksema u doslovnom ili prenesenom značenju [...] koji se s određenom učestalošću ostvaruje ili s određenom očekivanošću može ostvariti u upotrebi” (STOJIĆIĆ 2010: 38). Syntagmatic relations that tend to occur more prominently than others are considered to be more salient, and perhaps, in effect, more normative. When words co-occur, habitually or frequently, a bond is created. Following Fitzpatrick and Thwaites (2020), who stated that L2 lexemes need not be distinct from L1 concepts, we attempted to disambiguate between the respondents’ comprehension and the distribution patterns of the two adjectives in each pair of stimuli. A list of all the observed larger frameworks of meanings associated with the pairs of stimuli can be found at the end of the paper in Appendix A (for syntagmatic relations) and Appendix B (for encyclopedic responses).

Liu (2010) studied syntagmatic relations with the underlying assumption that collocations are not arbitrary, but semantically motivated. Therefore, the syntagmatic relations identified among associative responses are also motivated, as they have been retrieved from the respondents' existing and active mental lexicon. A case in point, Nikishova and Kryvonosova (2019: 51) analyzed what they perceived to be the three main components of a comparative analysis of how different languages convey hues of the color red. Their conclusion was that the underlying semantic component was much the same, but that the linguistic realizations differ.

Viewed as a whole, more syntagmatic relations were recorded for the Serbian equivalents than for the Anglicisms, indicating a considerable level of fossilization in the use of the former. Since the adjectives that made up the pairs of stimuli in this study are considered (near) synonyms, their distribution patterns (syntagmatic relations) were used as a way of distinguishing between them. Niche meanings of the Anglicisms were recorded in situations where their co-occurrences in English were also, to an extent, adopted into Serbian (*loukost* for example). They are unlikely to acquire broader distribution patterns in the RL. Gottlieb and Furiassi (2015: 26) even went on to say the following: "the fact that the Anglicism either does not formally exist in English or is used with a different meaning in the RL justifies the choice of the label *pseudo-* (or *false*)".

Identical larger frameworks of meaning associated with the most frequently occurring syntagmatic responses were noted for most of the pairs of adjectives (23 pairs or 57.5%). Different larger frameworks of meaning were noted for 17 (42.5%) of the pairs. The situation is much the same for the encyclopedic responses. For most of the pairs of adjectives (21 or 52.5%), identical larger frameworks of meaning associated with the most frequently occurring encyclopedic responses were noted. In 13 pairs (47.5%), different larger frameworks of meaning were noted.

All the aforementioned types of responses mutually interact to provide us with information on the level of familiarity/acceptance<sup>5</sup> of the adjectival Anglicisms selected for this study. The more similar the meaning of the adjectives found among the responses to the core meaning of the stimuli, the stronger the indication that the said stimuli have reached a higher level of familiarity/acceptance. Furthermore, the higher the level of proficiency, the greater the number of syntagmatic relations that a learner can cite (NATION, 2001). Based on our findings, the respondents, by providing a higher number of synonyms for the stimuli in the form of Anglicisms included in this study, did in fact indicate a level of familiarity with them, and their acceptance of them. Even though the average number of synonyms provided for the two kinds of stimuli was quite similar (4% on average for the Anglicisms, and 5% on average for the equivalents), it does not indicate that they are likely to suppress the entrenched equivalents. This is confirmed by the prevalence of syntagmatic relations provided in response to the equivalents (which are almost double in number compared to those provided for the Anglicisms), and the prevalence of encyclopedic responses provided in response to the Anglicisms (albeit a very slight one). In general, Anglicisms tend to increase their semantic content through more frequent use, a point illustrated by Milić (2013: 109–110), who stated

---

<sup>5</sup> Familiarity and acceptability are considered mutually and indivisibly related terms in this study, ones which should not be studied in isolation.

that in instances of near synonymy between the Anglicism and its Serbian equivalent a semantic-stylistic differentiation usually occurs on the part of the Anglicism. When it does not, the frequency of occurrence of the Anglicism suppresses the occurrence of the Serbian equivalent.

Based on the activation of different parts of the mental lexicon, and different distribution patterns, it is likely that the Anglicisms will continue to surface in particular co-occurrences and continue to have more specific meanings. This, once again, speaks in favor of hypothesis 3. These findings also fully confirm hypothesis 4, whereby we can claim that the syntagmatic relations identified for the Serbian equivalents exceed those for the Anglicisms. And finally, it is possible to provide full confirmation of hypothesis 5, as the encyclopedic responses did indicate differences in the interpretation of the adjectives that formed the pairs of stimuli.

4.2. RESPONSES GROUPED BASED ON WORD CLASSES AND DIFFERENT SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES. Depending on the word class membership of the responses, the Anglicisms (32.37%) and equivalents (32.07%) were equally susceptible to responses in the form of adjectives. Even the range of adjectival responses per stimulus was similar (Anglicisms: 0–67 and equivalents: 2–62). A comparison of the pairs of stimuli revealed that in one pair the number of adjectival responses was similar, in 19 the number was higher for the Anglicism, while in 20 pairs the number was lower for the Anglicism. The results are presented in Table 2.

Word classes and different syntactic structures	Anglicisms	Serbian equivalents
Nouns	33.5%	52.32%
Adjectives	32.37%	32.05%
Syntagms	1.7%	1.87%
Other <sup>6</sup>	1.42%	1.66%

Table 2. Word classes and different syntactic structures<sup>7</sup>

Even though polar opposites may have been expected by some (McNEILL 1963; DEESE 1964), along with paradigmatic responses Dragičević (1996; 2005; 2007; 2010), this was not confirmed in the present study. Furthermore, in relation to the findings of Kiš (2020: 95), which pertain to the semantic functions of adjectival complements, in the current study the most frequently noted complements were explicative ones (i.e. nouns were provided both as examples of syntagmatic relations and encyclopedic responses). Therefore, nouns are the most frequent type of response both to the Anglicisms as adjectival stimuli and to their Serbian equivalents. Adjectives, on the other hand, were predominantly included among the antonyms, in part encyclopedic responses, and to a lesser extent indicated synonymy and hyponymy. In addition, our study showed that antonyms were neither the dominant response to the Anglicisms as stimuli, nor to their Serbian equivalents.

<sup>6</sup> The type labelled 'other' includes clauses (0.5% and 0.57%), verbs (0.47% and 0.22%), prepositional phrases (0.3% and 0.35%), pronouns (0.1% and 0.32%), numerals (0.05% and 0.17%), and prepositions (0% and 0.02%).

<sup>7</sup> The results are presented in descending order, first for the Anglicisms, then for the equivalents.

The data presented here do not confirm hypothesis 2, in the sense that the most frequently occurring responses were not in fact adjectives. In addition, the responses that were adjectives were rarely the polar opposites of the stimuli in question (on average 0.7% of the responses per stimulus).

4.3. THE LEVEL OF FAMILIARITY/ACCEPTANCE OF THE RECENT ADJECTIVAL ANGLICISMS. The criteria for the acceptance of recent Anglicisms, in addition to the previously analyzed types of responses, also includes the occurrence of antonyms, (potential) collocations, and derivationally linked lexemes. The lack of familiarity/acceptance of the selected recent Anglicisms is indicated by the occurrence of unrelated and missing responses. Hypothesis 1 proposed that more of these responses will be recorded among the Anglicisms as stimuli. In sum, the percentage of missing responses to the Anglicisms as stimuli was four times greater than that to their Serbian equivalents (16.68% and 3.98%). For unrelated responses it was twice as great (13% and 7.3%). This fully confirms the hypothesis and indicates a lack of entrenchment (low familiarity and/or acceptance) of the given Anglicisms in the lexical system of the Serbian language.

Based on the abovementioned, it is possible to determine the level of familiarity/acceptance of the selected Anglicisms. It would appear that, due to the slight difference between the average number of synonyms provided for both the Anglicisms and their equivalents, the respondents were not familiar with their meanings in certain instances. This was also confirmed by the larger frameworks of meaning identified in the analysis of the syntagmatic relations and encyclopedic responses. To reiterate: the Anglicisms from the pairs of stimuli were provided as responses to their Serbian equivalents in only 1.8% of the cases; there were fewer synonymous responses than syntagmatic responses, which is a sign of lower familiarity/acceptance as indicated by Deese (1964), as well as Piper, Dragičević, and Stefanović (2005); the number of missing responses to the Anglicisms was four times greater than that to the Serbian equivalents; and the number of unrelated responses to the Anglicisms was twice as high compared to the Serbian equivalents. This lack of familiarity/acceptance may be the result of infrequent exposure, and the ensuing infrequent use and/or incomprehension. For example, Panić-Kavgić (2006) stated that there is a certain level of misunderstanding among native speakers of Serbian when they first come into contact with an Anglicism. Furthermore, Gottlieb and Furiassi claimed that the “salience of Anglicisms typically surpasses their statistical representation” (2015: 22), i.e., the frequency of occurrence of Anglicisms is surprisingly low, despite what many purists might contend. A similar fact was also presented by Milić (2013: 144–145), who stated that adjectival monolexemic Anglicisms in the Serbian language amount to approximately 3% of the analyzed corpus.

However, it is important to mention that a certain level of familiarity/acceptance was noted in those cases when the Serbian equivalents were used as responses to the Anglicisms from the matching pairs of stimuli. The recent Anglicisms studied here, in general, proved to have more specific or niche meanings in the respondents’ mental lexicon.

The average value of familiarity/acceptance for the Serbian equivalents, which amounted to their potential frequency of occurrence in the compiled corpus,

was calculated. This value was set as a benchmark in relation to which we quantified the level of familiarity/acceptance of each Anglicism. The numbers of missing and of unrelated responses were subtracted from the overall number of responses to each stimulus, since the remaining types of responses speak in favor of the entrenchment of the stimuli in question. The calculated average level of familiarity/acceptance of the Serbian equivalents was 81.1%. The list of adjectival Anglicisms presented in descending level of familiarity/acceptance reads as follows:

*personalni* (97%), *tagovan* (96%), *finalizovan* (95%), *kjut* (95%), *krucijalan* (94%), *smart* (94%), *krispi* (93%), *promo* (93%), *originalan* (92%), *relaks* (91%), *sajber* (90%), *transplantiran* (90%), *kripi* (89%), *nutritivan* (89%), *asistiran* (85%), *pinovan* (85%), *frendli* (82%), *militari* (82%), *portabl* (76%), *sparkling* (75%), *dualan* (74%), *forvardovan* (72%), *loukost* (70%), *devastiran* (69%), *izigoing* (66%), *indor* (65%), *spuki* (65%), *lajkabilan* (64%), *zipovan* (57%), *hektičan* (49%), *mesi* (49%), *autorizovan* (48%), *rezilijentan* (48%), *lukrativan* (45%), *implementiran* (43%), *transgresivan* (43%), *revolving* (41%), *grog* (36%), *promptan* (26%), *beking* (14%).

For all the analyzed pairs of adjectives as stimuli, on average, a higher level of familiarity/acceptance was noted for the Serbian equivalents (81.1%) compared to the Anglicisms (70.67%), thus resulting in greater numerical values for the latter within individual pairs of adjectival stimuli. Only in one-fifth of the pairs had a higher level of acceptance calculated for the Anglicism based on our formula. These pairs include: *personalni* (97% : 96%), *tagovan* (96% : 90%), *krucijalan* (94% : 93%), *krispi* (93% : 89%), *promo* (93% : 91%), *relaks* (91% : 87%), *nutritivan* (89% : 87%), *asistiran* (85% : 60%).

4.4. A COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES PROVIDED BY THE SERBIAN LANGUAGE MAJORS AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE MAJORS. The Independent samples T-test was used to analyze the frequency of types of associative responses provided by the SLMs and the ELMs. A statistically significant difference was noted only for the syntagmatic responses (Sig. 0.009). On average, the SLMs provided syntagmatic responses for all the adjectival stimuli somewhat more frequently than the ELMs (SLMs – 25.48; ELMs – 24.72). Even though the differences are not great, they are still statistically significant (F-test – 7.04). Nouns were, prior to the statistical analyses, determined to be the most frequently occurring type of response (as in ЈАКИЋ ШИМШИЋ 2021: 192), a finding which is directly linked to the recorded numbers of syntagmatic responses. Specifically, in the current study, nouns made up 33.5% of the responses to the Anglicisms as stimuli, and 52.32% of the responses to the Serbian equivalents as stimuli.

For the SLMs, increased frequency of occurrence of syntagms among the Serbian equivalents as stimuli is not surprising, as they could be considered more normative and thus indicate a certain level of fossilization since the respondents' L1 is Serbian. As Ufimtseva (2014: 37) was previously quoted as saying, associative responses do tend to reflect the 'verbal and nonverbal experiences' recorded in the respondents' L1. These points speak in favor of the impact that the L1 had on the recorded associative responses. The comparably high rate of syntagmatic responses among the ELMs might also be ascribed to their levels of L2 proficiency. According to Khazaenezhad and Alibabae (2013), increased levels of L2 proficiency have been linked to an increased level of paradigmatic responses.



A similar conclusion was also reached by Nation (2001), who stated that higher numbers of produced L2 syntagms indicated higher levels of L2 proficiency. To that we also add the conclusion reached by Fitzpatrick and Thwaites (2020), who stated that depth of knowledge of a word can be determined based on the number of its link to other words in the same lexicon.

In addition to the impact that the L1 and L2 may have on the occurrence of these responses, it is also important to refer to other, education-related factors. For example, the coursework of the respondents enrolled in the Department of Serbian Language and Literature is such that their obligatory and additional reading material are all in Serbian (all the primary and secondary resources, literary works, and critiques are in Serbian, irrespective of whether they were originally written in a different language), and that the Serbian language is the dominant language used in the classroom. All of the courses related to the grammar of the Serbian language are organized in such a way that the respondents are given examples which are contextualized, in the form of syntagms and clauses, to illustrate the main points pertaining to Serbian language grammar. This group of respondents may be more finely attuned to providing, due to exposure, these types of responses.

When analyzing the differences in the associative responses solely to the Anglicisms or solely to the Serbian equivalents as stimuli, the following was determined. In the case of the Anglicisms as stimuli, statistically significant differences were noted among:

- syntagmatic responses, whereby the ELMs provided syntagmatic responses more frequently than the SLMs (F-test – 11.43; Sig. 0.01);
- synonyms, whereby the ELMs provided synonyms more frequently than the SLMs (F-test – 8.29; Sig. 0.005);
- antonyms, whereby the ELMs provided antonyms more frequently than the SLMs (F-test – 10.73; Sig. 0.001);
- examples of hyponymy, whereby the ELMs provided hyponymous responses more frequently than the SLMs (F-test – 7.25; Sig. 0.08).

In order to present the data more clearly, the frequency of occurrence of the types of associative responses, in percentages, are provided in Table 3.

Category	Stimuli	SLM responses	ELM responses
Synonymy	Anglicisms	<b>22.66%</b>	<b>24.57%</b>
	Equivalents	21.69%	17.47%
Syntagmatic	Anglicisms	20.35%	24.79%
	Equivalents	<b>44.21%</b>	<b>36.78%</b>
Encyclopedic	Anglicisms	<b>22.01%</b>	<b>22.51%</b>
	Equivalents	19.47%	21.97%
Antonymy	Anglicisms	0.05%	0.27%
	Equivalents	<b>0.92%</b>	<b>1.29%</b>
Hyponymy	Anglicisms	1.25%	2.33%
	Equivalents	<b>6.57%</b>	<b>5.37%</b>
Derivatives	Anglicisms	0.32%	0.49%
	Equivalents	<b>0.51%</b>	<b>0.76%</b>

Unrelated	Anglicisms	<b>12.49%</b>	<b>14.43%</b>
	Equivalents	4.81%	10.09%
Missing responses	Anglicisms	<b>20.67%</b>	<b>10.52%</b>
	Equivalents	2.4%	5.75%

Table 3. The comparison between the SLMs and ELMs<sup>8</sup>

Higher percentages were noted for the Anglicisms as stimuli for both the SLMs and ELMs in the case of synonyms, encyclopedic knowledge, unrelated responses, and missing responses. Higher percentages were noted for the Serbian equivalents as stimuli for both groups in the case of syntagmatic relations, antonyms, hyponymy, and derivatives.

The SLMs scored higher percentages for Serbian equivalents as stimuli for the following types of responses: synonymy, syntagmatic relations, and hyponymy. The only time they scored higher percentages for the Anglicisms as stimuli was for missing responses.

The ELMs scored higher percentages for the Anglicisms as stimuli for the following types of responses: synonymy, syntagmatic relations, encyclopedic knowledge, antonymy, hyponymy, derivatives, unrelated. The only time they scored higher percentages for the Serbian equivalents as stimuli was for missing responses. For encyclopedic knowledge, antonymy, derivatives, and unrelated responses the ELMs consistently scored higher percentages for both types of stimuli.

The occurrence of syntagmatic responses has previously been addressed, along with implications of the impact of the L1 and L2. However, a point needs to be made regarding the status of synonyms in language acquisition and their link to syntagms. Specifically, numerous studies have indicated that learning words that are synonymous is more difficult than learning words whose meanings are not linked in this way (HIGA 1963; LAUFER 1990; TINKHAM 1993; WARING 1997; LIU and ZHONG 2014). Liu and Zhong (2014) in particular emphasized the point that disambiguation between the meanings of synonyms is achieved by learning their collocates (i.e., syntagms), and that higher L2 proficiency is linked to a greater knowledge of synonyms. Thus, the obtained statistically significant differences between the groups is not surprising.

The increased frequency of occurrence of all the aforementioned types of associative responses to the Anglicisms as stimuli among the population of ELMs can also be ascribed to the teaching process at the Department of English where they attend classes. Specifically, this group of students regularly take part in both Serbian to English and English to Serbian translation, which requires them to explicitly recall, cite, and compare the potential distribution patterns and differences in meaning between various related and unrelated lexemes (cf. STAMENKOVIĆ – TASIĆ 2020). Furthermore, this group of respondents takes part in oral exams for which they are regularly prepared to present pairs of words in different mutual relations. In other words, the respondents who were ELMs may have in a way

<sup>8</sup> The slightly darker cells represent the higher percentage values for either the SLMs or the ELMs. The percentages given in bold indicate higher values for either the Anglicisms as stimuli, or the Serbian equivalents as stimuli.

already been prepared for these kinds of activities. We should also not overlook the fact that their exposure to the English language is considerable, as all the English language and literature-related classes they attend on a daily basis are held in English (with the exception of courses in pedagogy, psychology, sociology), and all the obligatory and optional reading material is also in the same language.

When it comes to the Serbian equivalents, no statistically significant differences were determined among the types of associative responses for the two studied groups of respondents. This particular result can be explained by the fact that all of our respondents are native speakers of Serbian, in addition to being students of philology.

The ANOVA was used to determine whether any other factors, other than the study program the respondents are enrolled in, have an impact on the difference in the associative responses. In this instance, that factor was the self-reported knowledge of the English language. However, this analysis did not yield any statistically significant differences between the groups based on the level of knowledge of the English language and the provided associative responses for the two studied groups of respondents (cf. GREIDANUS and NIENHUS 2001 regarding proficiency). It can be assumed that the lack of statistical significance may, at least in part, be ascribed to the fact that the levels of English language proficiency were self-reported. This is the outcome of a lack of uniform testing of all the respondents, who did not take an English language proficiency test prior to the beginning of the study. Furthermore, some of the respondents even omitted to provide their self-reported levels of proficiency, which was subsequently determined based on their English language course requirements. Other factors that should be considered, but which lie outside the scope of our study, include exposure to Anglicisms in general (which probably differs on an item-to-item basis judging from the number of missing responses noted for some of the Anglicisms). In addition, the topic of motivation which has previously been touched upon in the text is also worth mentioning. Specifically, there is no way for us to determine whether the respondents in question were, or to what extent, motivated to learn and/or use the Anglicisms that were provided as stimuli. Frequency of exposure to these items may have had an impact on their performance within the study. And finally, it is worth mentioning that a case has already been made for the general low levels of familiarity of the respondents with some of the Anglicisms included in the study: the high number of recorded syntagmatic relations which leads to the conclusion that the Anglicisms were 'uncommon adjectives', that these Anglicisms were provided as responses to only 1.8% of the Serbian equivalents, and that the number of missing responses to the Anglicisms was four times greater than the number of the missing responses to the equivalents, and was twice as high for the unrelated responses.

**5. CONCLUSION.** The study aimed to determine the characteristics of the associative fields of recent adjectival Anglicisms and their Serbian equivalents as stimuli among a population of philology students by analyzing their associative responses. The associative approach was used to indicate how entrenched the selected adjectival Anglicism are in the mental lexicon of the respondents, and to illustrate the lexico-semantic relations between the Anglicisms and equivalents

as stimuli. The associative responses were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

The qualitative analysis was based on a comparison of the dominant types of associative responses (synonymy, hyponymy, syntagmatic relations, and encyclopedic knowledge) and their distribution patterns. It was used to identify the interpretations underlying the use of the Anglicism and its Serbian equivalent in each pair of adjectival stimuli and to uncover the potential differences between them. The key findings were the following: 1) the most frequently occurring responses were syntagmatic, encyclopedic, and synonymous, in that order; 2) not all the selected recent adjectival Anglicisms, despite being presented as synonyms of their Serbian equivalents, are equally familiar to the respondents, or equally accepted by them for use in the Serbian language; 3) the Anglicisms that exhibit higher levels of familiarity/acceptance are usually (near) synonyms of their equivalents, or sometimes exhibit specific distribution patterns which introduce new meanings into Serbian. The most frequently occurring word class among the associative responses was the noun.

The quantitative analysis included the Independent samples T-test and the ANOVA. While the ANOVA did not indicate statistical significance of the impact of English language proficiency on the associative responses of the SLMs and ELMs, the Independent samples T-test indicated a statistically significant and yet slight overall difference in the use of syntagmatic responses provided for both types of stimuli (Anglicisms and their Serbian equivalents), in favor of the SLMs. For the Anglicisms as adjectival stimuli, statistically significant differences were determined using the same test in favor of the ELMs for the following: synonymy, syntagms, hyponymy, and antonymy.

The results also confirmed some of the initial hypotheses. Hypothesis 1, which proposed that more missing and unrelated responses will be recorded for the Anglicisms as stimuli, was fully confirmed, which points to a lack of their entrenchment (familiarity/acceptance) in the lexical system of the Serbian language. Hypothesis 2, which stated that the most frequently occurring responses would take the form of adjectives, was not confirmed. In fact, the most frequently occurring word class among the responses to the Anglicisms and the equivalents as stimuli was that of the noun. Albeit, the nouns outnumbered the adjectives by a very narrow margin. Hypothesis 3 was also fully confirmed, since the Anglicisms were noted to have context-specific, niche meanings. These meanings, derived from the noted syntagmatic relations, also confirmed hypothesis 4, indicating that the distribution patterns of the Anglicisms were not as entrenched as those of the equivalents. Hypothesis 5 was not confirmed in full, since the range of encyclopedic responses pointed to differences in interpretation motivated by different stimuli (Anglicisms vs their Serbian equivalents). Hypothesis 6 was also not confirmed in full. Specifically, differences in favor of the SLMs were noted for syntagmatic responses provided for both the Anglicisms and Serbian equivalents as stimuli. Additional differences were noted in favor of the ELMs, but only in the case of Anglicisms as stimuli, where they outperformed the SLMs in terms of synonymy, syntagms, hyponymy, and antonymy. In sum, the tendencies of these two groups of respondents were mostly similar in terms of their associative re-

sponses to both types of stimuli. Differences were noted only when particular types of responses were taken into consideration.

And finally, based on a quantitative analysis of the level of familiarity and/or acceptance of the Anglicisms included in the pairs of adjectival stimuli, a lower level was calculated for the Anglicisms compared to that of their Serbian equivalents, on average. As a result, they will continue to be associated with niche meanings in their RL.

One of the limitations of the current study might be that it included adjectives and their Serbian equivalents from just one dictionary. Another, also important limitation to mention is the number of respondents. The validity of the results may increase with a greater number of respondents, which might mean as many as several hundred. Furthermore, although the sample of respondents is homogeneous, it may be taken as a limitation that they all originated from the same region of the country and thus from the same university. Future studies might consider expanding this pool.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: SYNTAGMATIC RELATIONS

Pairs of adjectives	Larger framework(s) of meaning associated with the most frequently occurring syntagmatic responses	Pairs of adjectives	Larger framework(s) of meaning associated with the most frequently occurring syntagmatic responses
<i>asistirani</i>	offering and receiving assistance	<i>originalan</i>	the artworld
<i>potpomognut</i>		<i>izvorni</i>	academic work
<i>autorizovan</i>	provided authentication	<i>personalni</i>	trainers and belongings
<i>ovlašćen</i>		<i>lični</i>	
<i>bejing</i>	backup singers	<i>pinovan</i>	online communication
<i>prateći</i>		<i>istaknut</i>	individuals
<i>grog</i>	hospital patients	<i>portabl</i>	electronic appliances
<i>ošamućen</i>		<i>prenosan</i>	devices and contagious viral infections
<i>devastiran</i>	humans and cities	<i>promo</i>	advertising
<i>razoren</i>		<i>reklamni</i>	
<i>dualan</i>	double in nature/kind	<i>promptan</i>	responses
<i>dvostruk</i>		<i>brz</i>	animals
<i>zipovan</i>	formats	<i>revolving</i>	financial transactions
<i>spakovan</i>	suitcases	<i>obnovljiv</i>	energy sources
<i>izigoing</i>	people and their appearance	<i>rezilijentan</i>	individuals
<i>ležeran</i>		<i>izdržljiv</i>	
<i>implementiran</i>	systems	<i>relaks</i>	aids
<i>primenjen</i>	methods	<i>opuštajući</i>	
<i>indor</i>	activities and organs	<i>sajber</i>	behavior
<i>unutrašnji</i>		<i>kompjuterski</i>	computers
<i>kjut</i>	physical traits	<i>smart</i>	technology
<i>simpatičan</i>		<i>pametn</i>	individuals

<i>kripi</i>	stories, behavior	<i>sparkling</i>	beverages, rocks that sparkle
<i>jeziv</i>	images	<i>svetlucač</i>	city lights
<i>krispi</i>	fried/baked goods	<i>spuki</i>	Halloween and crime
<i>hrskav</i>		<i>sablstan</i>	
<i>krucijalan</i>	parts of things	<i>tagovan</i>	online communication
<i>odlučujući</i>		<i>označen</i>	written communication
<i>lajkabilan</i>	physical features	<i>transgresivan</i>	human behavior
<i>dopadljiv</i>		<i>nekonvencionalan</i>	
<i>loukost</i>	travel arrangements	<i>transplantiran</i>	human organs
<i>povoljan</i>	financial transactions	<i>presađen</i>	plant maintenance
<i>lukrativan</i>	business ventures	<i>finalizovan</i>	processes
<i>unosan</i>		<i>završen</i>	
<i>mesi</i>	untidiness	<i>forvardovan</i>	email
<i>neuredan</i>		<i>prosleđen</i>	online written communication
<i>militari</i>	the army	<i>frendli</i>	behavior
<i>vojnički</i>		<i>prijatan</i>	pleasantries
<i>nutritivan</i>	food	<i>hektičan</i>	living conditions
<i>hranljiv</i>		<i>užurban</i>	human behavior

## APPENDIX B: ENCYCLOPEDIA RESPONSES

Pairs of adjectives	Larger framework(s) of meaning associated with the most frequently occurring encyclopedic responses	Pairs of adjectives	Larger framework(s) of meaning associated with the most frequently occurring encyclopedic responses
<i>asistirani</i>	assistance	<i>originalan</i>	products of creative work
<i>potpomognuti</i>		<i>izvorni</i>	sources of information
<i>autorizovani</i>	providers of assistance	<i>personalni</i>	something that is one's own
<i>ovlašćeni</i>		<i>lični</i>	
<i>bežnjač</i>	support	<i>pinovan</i>	importance
<i>prateći</i>	individuals with a supporting role	<i>istaknut</i>	
<i>grogi</i>	causes of the sensation	<i>portabil</i>	devices
<i>ošamućen</i>		<i>prenosan</i>	communicable disease
<i>devastirani</i>	emotional and physical decay	<i>promo</i>	advertising
<i>razoreni</i>		<i>reklamni</i>	
<i>dualan</i>	education	<i>promptan</i>	a state of readiness
<i>dvostruk</i>		<i>brz</i>	
<i>zipovani</i>	folders	<i>revolving</i>	planetary objects
<i>spakovani</i>	suitcases	<i>obnovljiv</i>	energy sources
<i>izigođeni</i>	lack of burden	<i>rezilijentan</i>	strength and stamina
<i>ležerani</i>	casual apparel	<i>izdržljiv</i>	
<i>implementirani</i>	applicability in practice	<i>relaks</i>	state of relaxation
<i>primenjeni</i>	applied science	<i>opuštajući</i>	
<i>indor</i>	space	<i>sajber</i>	the internet

<i>unutrašnji</i>	plumbing and affairs	<i>kompjuterski</i>	information technology
<i>kjut</i>	animals	<i>smart</i>	people
<i>simpatičan</i>	people	<i>pametan</i>	
<i>kripi</i>	things and people	<i>sparkling</i>	water
<i>jeziv</i>	Halloween	<i>svetluca</i>	things that reflect light
<i>krispi</i>	fried/baked goods	<i>spuki</i>	Halloween
<i>hrskav</i>		<i>sablstan</i>	things that scare
<i>krucijalan</i>	things of crucial importance	<i>tagovan</i>	posting on Instagram
<i>odlučujući</i>	decisions	<i>označen</i>	marks of origin or quality
<i>lajkabilan</i>	people	<i>transgresivan</i>	committing an offense
<i>dopadljiv</i>		<i>nekonvencionalan</i>	things that are non-standard
<i>loukost</i>	prices	<i>transplantiran</i>	human organs
<i>povoljan</i>		<i>presaden</i>	plants
<i>lukrativan</i>	something useful	<i>finalizovan</i>	activities
<i>unosan</i>	sources of considerable income	<i>završen</i>	
<i>mesi</i>	(un)cleanliness	<i>forvardovan</i>	messages
<i>neuredan</i>		<i>prosleđen</i>	things
<i>militari</i>	the army	<i>frendli</i>	friends
<i>vojnički</i>		<i>prijatan</i>	
<i>nutritivan</i>	nutritional value	<i>hektičan</i>	feelings of nervous energy/
<i>hranjiv</i>		<i>užurban</i>	hyperactivity

## SOURCES

SRNA: *Srpski rečnik novijih anglicizama* (red. Prčić, Tvrтко, Jasmina Dražić, Mira Milić, Milan Ajdžanović, Sonja Filipović Kovačević, Olga Panić Kavgić, Strahinja Stepanov). Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu, 2021.

\*

APCJ: *Асоцијативни речник српскога језика* (Предраг Пипер, Рајна Драгићевић, Марија Стефановић). Београд: Београдска књига – Службени лист СЦГ – Филолошки факултет у Београду, 2005.

PCJ: *Речник српскога језика* (ур. Мирослав Николић). Нови Сад: Матице српске, 2007.

## REFERENCES

- DEESE, James. The Associative Structure of Some Common English Adjectives. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 3 (1964): 347–357.
- DRLJAČA MARGIĆ, Branka. Leksički paralelizam: je li opravdano govoriti o nepotrebnim posuđenicama (engleskog podrijetla). *Fluminensia* 23/1 (2011): 53–66.
- DURRANT, Philip, Alice DOHERTY. Are High-Frequency Collocations Psychologically Real? Investigating the Thesis of Collocational Priming. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 6/2 (2010): 125–155.
- FILIPOVIĆ, Rudolf. *Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo, razvoj, značenje*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Školska knjiga, 1990.

- FILIPOVIĆ-KOVAČEVIĆ, Sonja. Anglicizmi kao međujezički pojmovni amalgami. *Зборник Мајџице српске за филологију и лингвистику* 54/2 (2011): 247–263.
- FILLMORE, Charles. Frame Semantics and the Nature of Language. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences: Conference on the Origin and Development of Language and Speech* 280/1 (1976): 20–32.
- FITZPATRICK, Tess. Habits and Rabbits: Word Associations and the L2 Lexicon. *EUROSLA Yearbook* 6/1 (2006): 121–145.
- FITZPATRICK, Tess. Word Association Patterns: Unpacking the Assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 17/3 (2007): 319–331.
- FITZPATRICK, Tess, Cristina IZURA. Word Association in L1 and L2: An Exploratory Study of Response Types, Response Times, and Interlingual Mediation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 33 (2011): 373–398.
- FITZPATRICK, Tess, Peter THWAITES. Word Association Research and the L2 lexicon. *Language Teaching* 53/3 (2020): 237–274.
- FITZPATRICK, Tess, David PLAYFOOT, Alison WRAY, Margaret J. WRIGHT. Establishing the Reliability of Word Association Data for Investigating Individual and Group Differences. *Applied Linguistics* 36/1 (2015): 23–50.
- GOTTLIEB, Henrik, Cristiano FURIASSI. Getting to Grips with False Loans and Pseudo-Anglicisms. Cristiano Furiassi, Henrik Gottlieb, *Pseudo-English: Studies on False Anglicisms in Europe*. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2015, 1–34.
- GREIDANUS, Tine, Lydius NIENHUIS. Testing the Quality of Word Knowledge in a Second Language by Means of Word Associations: Types of Distractors and Types of Associations. *Modern Language Journal* 85 (2001): 567–577.
- HALAS POPOVIĆ, Ana. Metaphoric Meanings of English Adjectives *Sharp* and *Blunt* and Serbian Adjectives *oštar* and *tup* from a Cognitive Linguistic Perspective. *Годишњак Филозофског факултета у Новом Саду* 47/1 (2022): 27–45.
- HE, Huaqing, Yunfei DENG. The Mental Lexicon and English Vocabulary Teaching. *English Language Teaching* 8/7 (2015): 40–45.
- HIGA, Masanori. Interference Effects of Intralist Word Relationships in Verbal Learning. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 2 (1963): 170–175.
- JIANG, Wenyin. Word Association Responses in L1 and L2 to the Chinese Word *yueliang* (moon): Implications for L2 Vocabulary Instruction. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 6/2 (2019): 9–18.
- KHAZAEENEZHAD, Bahareh, Ahmad ALIBABAEI. Investigating the Role of L2 Language Proficiency in Word Association Behavior of L2 Learners: A Case of Iranian EFL Learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 3/1 (2013): 108–115.
- KROLL, Judith F., Erika STEWART. Category Interference in Translation and Picture Naming: Evidence for Asymmetric Connections Between Bilingual Memory Representations. *Journal of Memory and Language* 33 (1994): 149–174.
- LAUFER, Batia. Words You Know: How They Affect the Words you Learn. Jacek Fisiak (ed.). *Further Insights into Contrastive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990, 573–593.
- LIU, Dilin. Going Beyond Patterns: Involving Cognitive Analysis in the Learning of Collocations. *TESOL Quarterly* 44/1 (2010): 4–30.
- LIU, Dilin, Shaouman ZHONG. L1 and L2 Use of Synonymy: An Empirical Study of Synonym Use/Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics* 37/2 (2014): 239–261.
- MCCARTHY, Michael. *Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- MEARA, Paul. *Connected Words: Word Associations and Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009.
- MILIĆ, Mira. *Anglicizmi kao sinonimi u srpskom jeziku*, edicija *E-disertacija*, knjiga 4. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2013. <<http://digitalna.ff.uns.ac.rs/sadrzaj/2013/978-86-6065-166-4>> 29. 4. 2023.
- MIŠIĆ ILIĆ, Biljana. Anglosrpski i Serghlish: Dva varijeteta srpskog jezika nastala pod uticajem engleskog. Vera Vasić (ur.). *Jezik u upotrebi / Language in use*. Novi Sad: Društvo za primenjenu lingvistiku Srbije, 2011, 71–93.
- MIŠIĆ ILIĆ, Biljana, Vesna LORIĆ. Pragmatički anglicizmi u srpskom jeziku. *Зборник Мајџице српске за филологију и лингвистику* LIV/1 (2011): 261–273.
- MIŠIĆ ILIĆ, Biljana. Is There Life in Serbia Without Anglicisms? A Pragmatic View. Tvrtko Prčić, Maja Marković, Vladislava Gordić Petković, Predrag Novakov, Zoran Paunović, Ivana Đurić Paunović (ur.). *Engleski jezik i anglofone književnosti u teoriji i praksi, zbornik u čast Draganji Pervaz*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, 2014, 337–355.



- MIŠIĆ ILIĆ, Biljana. Pragmatic Borrowing from English into Serbian: Linguistic and Sociocultural Aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics* 113 (2017): 103–115.
- NATION, I. S. P. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.
- NIKISHOVA, Alla, Elena KRYVONOSOVA. Comparative Collocations as Cognitive Classifiers are Bases of Lexical Categories. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences* 1/1 (2019): 45–61.
- McNEILL, David. The Origin of associations Within the Same Grammatical Class. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 9 (1963): 250–262.
- ONYSKO, Alexander. *Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching*. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- PANIĆ-KAVGIĆ, Olga. *Koliko razumemo nove anglicizme*. Novi Sad: Zmaj, 2006.
- PRČIĆ, Tvrtko. Building Contact Linguistic Competence Related to English as the Nativized Foreign Language. *System* 42 (2014): 143–54.
- PRČIĆ, Tvrtko. *Semantika i pragmatika reči*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu, 2016<sup>3</sup>. <<https://digitalna.ff.uns.ac.rs/sadrzaj/2016/978-86-6065-356-9>> 15. 1. 2023.
- PRČIĆ, Tvrtko. *Engleski u srpskom*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet u Novom Sadu, 2019<sup>3</sup>. <<https://digitalna.ff.uns.ac.rs/sadrzaj/2019/978-86-6065-512-9>> 15. 1. 2023.
- ROTBURG, Iris. Connotative Structure of Adjectives. *Psychological Reports* 22 (1968): 841–848.
- SILAŠKI, Nadežda. *Srpski jezik u tranziciji: O anglicizmima u ekonomskom registru*. Beograd: Ekonomski fakultet, 2012.
- SINGLETON, David. *Exploring the Second Language Mental Lexicon*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- STAMENKOVIĆ, Dušan, Miloš TASIĆ. Uticaj konteksta na percepciju opravdanosti upotrebe anglicizama: empirijska analiza. Vesna Lopičić, Biljana Mišić Ilić (ur.). *Jezik, književnost, kontekst*. Niš: Filozofski fakultet, 2020, 225–245.
- STOJIČIĆ, Violeta. *Teorija kolokacija*. Beograd: Zadužbina Andrejević, 2010.
- TINKHAM, Thomas. The Effect of Semantic Clustering on the Learning of Second Language Vocabulary. *System* 21 (1993): 371–380.
- UFIMTSEVA, Natalya. The Associative Dictionary as a Model of the Linguistic Picture of the World. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 154 (2014): 36–43.
- WARING, Robert. The Negative Effects of Learning Words in Semantic Sets: A replication. *System* 25 (1997): 261–274.
- ZAREVA, Alla. Structure of the Second Language Mental Lexicon: How Does it Compare to Native Speakers' Lexical Organization?. *Second Language Research* 23/2 (2007): 123–153.
- ZHANG, Dongbo, Keiko Koda. Assessing L2 Vocabulary Depth with Word Associates Format Tests: Issues, Findings, and Suggestions. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education* 2/1 (2017): 1–30.

\*

- ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ, Рајна. О правим именичким и придевским антонимима. *Јужнословенски филолоџ* ЛП (1996): 25–39.
- ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ, Рајна. Вербалне асоцијације у семантичким истраживањима. Предраг Пипер, Рајна Драгићевић, Марија Стефановић. *Асоцијативни речник српског језика*. Београд: Београдска књига – Службени гласник СЦГ – Филолошки факултет у Београду, 2005, 56–80.
- ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ, Рајна. *Лексиколоџија српског језика*. Београд: Завод за уџбенике, 2007.
- ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ, Рајна. *Вербалне асоцијације кроз српски језик и културу*. Београд: Друштво за српски језик и књижевност Србије, 2010.
- ДРАГИЋЕВИЋ, Рајна. Лапор плава и тупе сива – (не)одрживост неологизама за нијансе боја у српском језику. *Новоречје* 3/4 (2021): 9–18.
- ЈАКИЋ ШИМШИЋ, Милена. Асоцијативни односи придева у тесту слободних вербалних асоцијација српског језика. *Јужнословенски филолоџ* LXXVII/2 (2021): 185–199.
- ЈАНИЋ, Александра, Душан Стаменковић. *Енглеско-српска контирасивна лексиколоџија*. Ниш: Филозофски факултет, 2022.
- ЈАНКОВИЋ, Драган, Милена Јакић Шимшић. Развојни асоцијативни речник српског језика: анализа заступљености синтагматских и парадигматских асоцијата. *Лексикографска и лексиколоџија у светлу актуелних проблема*. Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ, 2021.
- КИШ, Наташа. Синтаксичко-семантичке карактеристике допуна придева. *Зборник Мајнице српске за филолоџију и лингвистику* 63/2 (2020): 75–98.

ПИПЕР, Предраг, Рајна Драгићевић, Марија Стефановић. Израда Асоцијативног речника српског језика. Предраг Пипер, Рајна Драгићевић, Марија Стефановић. *Асоцијативни речник српскога језика*. Београд – Београдска књига – Службени гласник СЦГ – Филолошки факултет у Београду, 2005, 95–101.

ТОДИЋ, Бојана. Природа асоцијативне везе антонима. *Наш језик* 47/3–4 (2016): 89–103.

ХАЛАС Поповић, Ана. Метафоре у семантици придева из домена чврстоће у енглеском и српском. *Зборник Мајице српске за филологију и лингвистику* 64/1 (2021): 147–169.

Александра Јанић  
Марта Величковић

## НОВИЈИ ПРИДЕВСКИ АНГЛИЦИЗМИ И ЊИХОВИ УСТАЉЕНИ ПАНДАНИ У СРПСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ: АСОЦИЈАТИВНИ ПРИСТУП

### Резиме

Предмет рада је анализа типова асоцијативних реакција на новије придевске англицизме и њихове устаљене пандане у српском језику, као и одређивање нивоа познатости/прихватљивости поменутих англицизама у српском језику код студената филолошке оријентације (србиста и англиста). Осамдесет једнозначних придева (40 англицизама и 40 пандана) испитаницима су дати као стимулуси. Вербалне асоцијације на англицизме поређене су са оним датим на устаљене пандане у српском језику. Такође, збирно су анализирани добијене асоцијативне реакције свих испитаника, али су и поређене реакције које су имали студенти Србистике и Англистике. Наиме, асоцијативни метод коришћен је да би се одредило колико дубоко су новији придевски англицизми (*асисџиран*, *ауџоризован*, *девасџиран* итд.) уклопљени у ментални лексикон испитаника у односу на своје устаљене пандане у српском језику (*јошјомоћнији*, *овлашћен*, *разорен* итд.). Реакције синтагматског и парадигматског типа на англицизме и устаљене пандане анализирани су квалитативно и квантитативно. Истраживање је показало да су најчешћи типови реакција синтагматске, енциклопедијске, синонимске, да новији англицизми нису подједнако познати/прихватљиви и да су најпознатији/најприхватљивији англицизми синоними устаљеним панданима који остварују нова значења у специфичним контекстима. Уочено је одсуство статистичке значајности утицаја нивоа познавања енглеског (АНОВА), али анализа јесте указала на статистички значајне разлике код реакција на англицизме у виду синонима, синтагматских спојева, хипонима и антонима (Т-тест). Водећи се квантитативном анализом нивоа познатости/прихватљивости англицизама датих као стимулуса, нижи степен познатости/прихватљивости јавио се у поређењу са њиховим устаљеним панданима. На основу уочених различитих синтагматских спојева, вероватно је да ће анализирани англицизми и даље имати ускоспецификована значења, условљена сфером употребе.

Aleksandra Janić  
University of Niš  
Faculty of Philosophy  
Department of Serbian Language and Literature  
Ćirila i Metodija 2, 18105 Niš, Serbia  
aleksandra.janic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

(Примљено: 29. марта 2023;  
прихваћено: 18. маја 2023)

Marta Veličković  
University of Niš  
Faculty of Philosophy  
Department of English  
Ćirila i Metodija 2, 18105 Niš, Serbia  
marta.velickovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs